THE VICTORIAN ERA SERIES

THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL

The Victorian Era Series

The Anglican Revival

The Anglican Revival

By

J. H. OVERTON, D.D.

Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln; author of
"The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (1800-1833)"
"Life of John Wesley", &c. &c.

Property of
CBF
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

HERBERT S. STONE & COMPANY
CHICAGO & NEW YORK
M DCCC XCVIII

Preface

The object of the following pages is to give a brief sketch of that Revival in the English Church which has been a marked feature of the Victorian Era. In one sense, indeed, it dates from the reign of William IV., for it began with the Oxford Movement of 1833; but that movement was only just beginning to make itself generally felt when Queen Victoria ascended the throne; so the Revival may with the strictest propriety be said to belong to the Victorian period. "The Anglican Revival" and "The Oxford Movement" are by no means convertible terms; if they were, the present sketch would be superfluous, for the Oxford movement has been handled by many pens; but there is not, so far as I am aware, any one single volume which gives a succinct account of the Anglican Revival. That revival owes a considerable part of its success to men who never came under the spell of the Oxford school, who carefully guarded themselves from being identified with it, and who, on occasions, were brought into collision with it. The Oxford Movement undoubtedly gave the first and most effective impulse to the revival, and its leaders claim the first place in any account of that

revival; but when the Oxford Movement suffered a partial collapse in the place of its birth in 1845, the Anglican Revival hardly received a check in its onward course. This will appear in detail in the present little work, which, though written by one who necessarily regarded the subject from the clerical point of view, has had the great advantage of passing through the crucible of a competent lay criticism. Mr. J. Holland Rose, the editor of the series, has carefully examined and freely criticised every part of it, and I desire thus publicly to express my deep obligation to him for his invaluable aid.

J. H. O.

November, 1897.

Contents

CHAPTER I

Introductory - - - - - - - - - *Page* 9

CHAPTER II

First Stage of the Movement (1833–1835) - - - 27

CHAPTER III

Second Stage of the Movement (1835–1839) - - 62

CHAPTER IV

Third Stage of the Movement (1839–1845) - - - 88

CHAPTER V

Oxford after Newman's Secession - - - - 121

CHAPTER VI

Cambridge and the Movement - - - - - 135

CHAPTER VII

The Movement in the Outer World—Dean Hook and Bishop Wilberforce - - - - - - 146

CHAPTER VIII

The Hampden and Gorham Cases and their results - 167

CHAPTER IX

The Movement and Public Worship - - - - 188

CHAPTER X

Causes of the Success of the Movement - - - 211

INDEX - - - - - - - - - 225

The Anglican Revival.

Chapter I.

Introductory.

In the period immediately preceding the Oxford Movement there was great bitterness in many quarters against the Church of England, and it was seriously thought, both by friends and foes, that her days as a national church were numbered. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, and the Reform Act of 1832 were regarded by many as anti-church measures. It was expected that the besom of reform, having commenced its work in the state, was now to be employed in cleansing the Augean stable of the church. The church herself seemed almost inclined to accept the inevitable, and to be preparing "to wrap her robes around her and die gracefully". She was quite ready to reform her real abuses, if she could do so without playing into the hands of her foes. In fact, she *had* begun, for thirty years or more, to reform herself. There was infinitely more life and vigour in her at the time of the Reform Bill than there had been at the close of

the eighteenth century. It is perfectly wonderful to observe how many new agencies for good had been set on foot by her, and what fresh vitality had been given by her to old ones in the interval. The Church Missionary Society, founded in 1799, was making great progress in Africa and the East, and also in India. New life had been given to the older societies, both to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The National Society for the education of the poor was founded in 1812 on the principle that "the national religion should be made the ground-work of national education" (hence the name), and was prospering and extending its operations beyond the most sanguine expectations of its friends. The Indian episcopate, which at the outset met with great opposition, was at last firmly established, and gave a great impetus to mission work in India. The Church Building Society, founded in 1818, met half-way the great liberality of the state, and it is computed that, between parliamentary grants, the work of this society, and individual efforts, a sum of not less than six millions of pounds was spent in the building and reparation of churches from 1818 to 1833,—that is, far more than in the hundred years preceding 1818.

And yet the church found that the more active she was, the more unpopular she became. The state of things was quite different from what it had been a hundred years before, when the trumpet-

tongue of Wesley began to rouse the slumbering church from her lethargy. *Then*, from a number of circumstances which this is not the place to particularize, the church had undoubtedly sunk to a very low ebb as a spiritual, though not as an intellectual, force; but this could not fairly be said *now*. The abuses which led to the Evangelical Revival are obvious enough; but these abuses, if not entirely removed, were certainly far less glaring when the outcry against the church reached its climax about the year 1832. The English people are not unjust, and it seems at the first blush unaccountable that the church should have reached the height of her unpopularity just at a time when she was, in one sense, singularly fruitful in good works. But those who penetrate beneath the surface will find an easy explanation of the anomaly by two considerations:

(1) The odium against the church was more apparent than real; its expression proceeded from a noisy minority, not from the quiet majority. When the question was fairly put to the bulk of the nation, "Are you, or are you not, attached to the church of your fathers? do you, or do you not, wish to see it weakened, and, if possible, destroyed?", to the surprise even of those who put it the answer came, "Yes, we *are* attached to it; and we will maintain it to the last gasp!"

(2) The activity of the church mainly proceeded from one or the other of two parties, which, both together, constituted only a very small proportion

of the whole body. These parties were called respectively "the Evangelicals" and "the orthodox". The Evangelicals were then undoubtedly the strongest spiritual force in the church; so much so that when a person was spoken of as "a serious" or "a religious" person, it meant practically that he was an Evangelical. But the Evangelicals were essentially a party within the church, not a leaven leavening the whole body. And if, on the one hand, they exercised an attractive, on the other hand they certainly exercised a repulsive power; and that, not only among mere worldlings, but also among very many who were by no means deficient in spiritual earnestness. It is a significant fact that the whole current of that literary outburst of poetry and prose, which is so remarkable a feature of the early nineteenth century, and which had been quite unparallelled since the days of Queen Elizabeth, set against the Evangelicals. Not one of the really great writers who have shed an immortal lustre upon the period had the least sympathy with Evangelicalism; while some of them wrote directly against it. Those again who made theology their special study were dissatisfied with the thinness of the theology of the Evangelicals; while men of the world, in the good as well as in the bad sense of that term, revolted against the narrow and rather arbitrary restrictions and distinctions which they made. Hence scant justice was done, outside their own circle, to their truly saintly characters and the excellent practical

work which they did, of which their share in the abolition of the slave-trade is only one out of many instances.

The other party, which must be credited with a very large share of the church activity of the period, was that of "the orthodox"; but these formed a smaller and less widely influential party than the Evangelicals. They were the best representatives of the old High Church divines, who have always been the backbone of the Church of England; and of their practical energy in all kinds of religious and philanthropic work we are reaping the benefit to this very day. But their influence was not widely extended; they moved within their own circle, and those outside that circle gave, at most, "an otiose assent" (to use a pregnant phrase of Bishop Butler) to their proceedings. Outsiders respected them—at a distance—as "sound churchmen" (which they were), but were not roused to any enthusiasm by their efforts.

The names given to these two parties respectively, "the Clapham sect" and "the Clapton sect", derived from their two chief centres, indicate correctly enough their weakness. Not that either of them formed, or desired to form, anything that could be rightly termed "a sect"; for neither of them followed any one leader; they were quite content to be simply members of the Church of England; but both were coteries within the church, and rather limited coteries too.

Outside both were the vast majority of churchmen, both lay and clerical, whose church principles were of the vaguest possible description. The Methodists knew what they meant, and the Roman Catholics knew what they meant; but, with the exception of the two parties which have been noted, churchmen of this period seem to have had no definite system of doctrine or worship. It is difficult to say what their opinions were—they *had* none that could be put into any tangible shape. If they were in the neighbourhood of any perfervid Evangelical, they yielded passively to his—or perhaps her—influence, rather on the principle of "anything for a quiet life" than from conviction; if they were in the neighbourhood of "the orthodox", they would be quite content to be reckoned among "church and king" men, and would back up their many schemes for good with their purses and the sanction of their names; the best of them were amiable but not impressive.

In short, the church as a whole was wanting in definiteness of doctrine and purpose during the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. But all the time there were elements at work which were leavening the mass gradually. The revival which is here to be narrated was no sudden movement, but was the logical result of various causes which had long been at work; and we cannot grasp the significance of what followed without some little knowledge of what these causes were.

Chief among them were the exertions of the two parties which have been noticed above.

The high church revival was not the antagonist but the supplement of the evangelical revival which preceded it. It has been remarked as a strange thing that so many who fell under the spell of the Oxford movement had been brought up under evangelical influences. But there was really nothing strange about it; it was a quite natural sequence of events. It was merely a passage from the subjective to the objective, from individualism to collectivism; from the great truth that "Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners" to the other and kindred great truth that "Almighty God purchased to himself an universal church by the precious blood of His dear Son". It was not the loss of anything, but the superaddition of something more to what was already there. If it was not this, it was a spurious, not a genuine, result of the movement.

As to the orthodox movement before 1833, it was essentially the same as the Anglican movement after 1833. The latter diverged from the former only when it went off at a tangent; and that part of it which *did* so diverge was never any proper part of the Anglican revival, as will appear in the sequel. The old and the new were one and the same thing, though they differed widely in their methods, their tempers, and their tones of mind. Hence John Keble would say to his Oxford friends when they propounded a theological statement: "It seems to

me just what my father taught me".[1] Hence Pusey, when he met Joshua Watson, the lay head of the Clapton sect, in his old age, was delighted, and perhaps a little surprised, to find how closely they agreed. "I cannot say", he writes, "how cheering it was to be recognized by you as carrying on the same torch which we had received from you and those of your generation, who had remained faithful to the old teaching. We seemed no longer separated by a chasm from the old times and old paths, to which we wished to lead people back; the links which united us to those of old seemed to be restored."[2]

Assuredly among the pioneers of the Anglican revival must be reckoned, first of all,—indirectly and remotely the Clapham sect, directly and very nearly the Clapton sect.

At the same time a number of causes had long been at work tending to create a craving which neither Clapham nor Clapton could supply. First among these were the writings of Sir Walter Scott. He revived a love of the beautiful both in nature and art, and an interest in antiquity which had well-nigh died out; he opened out to men's view a wider outlook; he dispelled narrow prejudices; he presented history under an aspect which was new to that generation; and in many other ways he prepared, all unconsciously, the soil for the seed which the Anglican movement was soon about to sow in

[1] Lock's *Keble*, p. 84. [2] Churton's *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, ii. 82.

it. More complicated and subtle, but certainly not less potent, was the influence of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, both in his prose, his poetry, and his conversation. Coleridge reminds one of Collingwood, who dropped on the ground wherever he went an acorn, which was pretty sure to spring up in due time. It is fair to say that Coleridge's trees, when they sprang up, were not all of the Anglican type, but some of them were; and all of them were of a very different type from that which was predominant before the movement.[1] William Wordsworth, owing chiefly to the influence of his brother Christopher, cast in his lot personally with "the orthodox", and showed no sympathy with the distinctive characteristics of the movement, eighteen years of which his prolonged life enabled him to see; but his poetry all tended to prepare the way for what was coming, and one of the chief leaders, John Keble, was in a sense his most ardent disciple.[2]

[1] To give specimens would be rather like presenting a number of detached bricks as specimens of a building; the whole tone which pervades his later writings, especially the *Aids to Reflection*, strikes a churchman far more forcibly than any particular passages do. But take the following passages: "The Church of Christ asks of the State neither wages nor dignities. She asks only protection and to be let alone. . . . The church here spoken of is not the kingdom of God which is within, and which cometh not with observation, but is most observable—a city built on a hill, and not to be hid—the Church visible and militant under Christ." . . . "There exists, God be thanked, a Catholic and Apostolic Church in England, and I thank God also for the constitutional and ancestral Church of England." . . . "The safest expression is, the Church of Christ in England, or the Catholic Church in England" (*On the Constitution of the Church and State*, ch. vii.).

[2] He dedicated to Wordsworth his Lectures delivered during the ten years in which he held the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford (1831–1841),

Next we come to two men of a very different type from those hitherto mentioned, John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, and Alexander Knox, his guide, philosopher, and friend. These men were not only pioneers, but actually anticipators of the movement in several important points. The famous "Appendix" to Bishop Jebb's sermons, of which Knox was virtually the author, might really almost have appeared as one of the *Tracts for the Times*, while many of the letters of Knox might have been the letters of a tract-writer.

We come yet nearer to the actual movement when we turn to the great work done by Hugh James Rose. Indeed Rose has been boldly claimed as the true "restorer of the old paths",[1] to restore which was avowedly the chief object of the whole movement. The claim may be so far admitted that of the workers before 1833 no one can for a moment compare with Hugh James Rose as far as *direct* work in the matter of church revival is concerned.

calling him "a true philosopher" and "a priest of Divine Truth". In his undergraduate days, as his closest friend tells us, he read Wordsworth's poems "with avidity; and the admiration for his poetry, which he conceived in youth, never waned in after-life". "He had been for many years an enthusiast in his admiration of the man and the poet", and when in 1839 Oxford conferred on Wordsworth an honorary degree, and it fell to Keble's lot as Poetry Professor to deliver the Creweian oration, he hailed the opportunity to pronounce a hearty panegyric upon his favourite (see *Memoir of the Rev. John Keble*, by Sir J. T. Coleridge, ch. i. p. 17; do., pp. 248–9). It was the blending of religion and philosophy, the sacredness of Nature as the outward expression of God, the sacredness of childhood, the sacredness of common life, expressed in Wordsworth's poems, which touched Keble, and which made those poems a real preparation for the movement which was to follow.

[1] Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, i. 116–295.

It has fallen to the lot of few men to call forth such enthusiastic admiration from his personal friends as did Mr. Rose. We might be inclined to take *cum grano* the strong expressions of his admiring biographer about the man "who, sixty years ago,[1] at a time of universal gloom, panic, and despondency, rallied the faint-hearted as with a trumpet-blast;—awoke the sleepers;—aroused the sluggish;—led on to glory the van of the church's army".[2] But the dean is amply borne out by others who knew Mr. Rose personally. Rose was, for instance, in Mr. T. Mozley's view, "the one commanding figure, and very lovable man, that the frightened and discomfited church-people were now [1833] rallying round. Few people have left so distinct an impression of themselves as this gentleman."[3] He was, in the opinion of Mr. Henry Bradshaw, a very high authority, "the man who, of all Cambridge men of that time, was the leading spirit in the great church revival".[4] In the opinion of Sir W. Palmer, he was "in his time a bright and shining light of the Church of England. He had been Christian Advocate of the University of Cambridge. He was the most powerful and most followed preacher there; a profound scholar, an eloquent orator, a deep thinker, and an admirable theologian. . . . Had this noble man lived, he

[1] Written in 1888. [2] Burgon, i. 116.

[3] Mozley's *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, i. 308. [4] Quoted by Burgon, i. 141.

would have been the greatest ornament and the most trusted leader of the church."[1] And finally, in words which have now become classical, he was the man "who, when hearts were failing, bade us stir up the gift that was in us, and betake ourselves to our true mother".[2] Mr. Rose's four sermons at Cambridge in 1826, "On the Commission and Consequent Duties of the Clergy", were by far the strongest and most effective appeal that had yet been made to the church to be up and doing; and his eight sermons, also delivered by him at Cambridge as Christian Advocate and Select Preacher in 1829, were equally rousing. Rose also started, and ably edited, the *British Magazine*, the first number of which appeared in March, 1832; it was afterwards accepted by the leaders of the movement as the organ of the party, and both Newman and Keble expressed their determination to support it, and not allow the *Tracts for the Times* to interfere with it;[3] and it was at Rose's parsonage that the first meeting was held, which led immediately and

[1] Article in the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1883.

[2] Newman's Dedication of his 4th volume of Sermons to H. J. Rose.

[3] See *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, i. 441; ii. 2, 3. Keble says to Newman: "I quite agree with you that Rose's magazine must be supported". Newman writes to Rose, Dec. 1883, on the subject of the Tracts, and "the difficulty about interfering with the *British Magazine*". "But", he adds, "we fancy we might sail in our little boat without the chance of your running us down. However, we wish in this matter [about issuing tracts *periodically*] to be guided entirely by you. The Church owes so much to the *British Magazine*, as the first publication which set up her standard when others shrank from doing so, that you have a right to this deference."

directly to the Oxford movement. But he died too early to see the final issue of that movement, though he lived long enough to find that there was much in its methods of which he disapproved. On the whole, therefore, it seems to me that he must be regarded as by far the most prominent and effective of the precursors of the revival, rather than its actual originator.

While H. J. Rose was affecting Cambridge, a very different man was in a very different way affecting Oxford, but still tending to the same general result. This was Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, whose lectures on the Book of Common Prayer opened out quite a new view to many of his hearers. Among those hearers were young men who afterwards became very prominent in the movement, such as Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, Isaac Williams, and Frederick Oakeley. From the pen of the last-named we have a graphic account of the kind of influence which these lectures exercised: "I am disposed", he writes, "to give a very prominent place among the proximate causes of the movement to the teaching of Dr. C. Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who died in 1829. . . . Besides being a man of independent thought considerably in advance of the high churchmen of his time, he had in his youth many opportunities of intercourse with French emigrant clergy, to whom he was indebted, as he told us, for truer views of the Catholic religion

than were generally current in this country. Upon the subjects of Church Authority, Episcopacy, the Apostolical Succession, and others with which the earlier Tracts were almost exclusively occupied, I do not remember to have derived any very definite ideas from Lloyd's teaching; but I do remember to have received from him an entirely new notion of Catholics and Catholic doctrine. . . . In his Lectures on the Anglican Prayer Book, he made us first acquainted with the Missal and the Breviary, as sources from which all that is best and noblest in that compilation is derived."[1] It must of course be remembered that this is the account of a Roman Catholic, and is therefore not perhaps quite expressed as Dr. Lloyd himself would have expressed it; but there is no reason whatever to doubt its substantial accuracy. Pusey was a thorough disciple of Dr. Lloyd, and on his premature death mourned for him as "a second father", "the guardian-friend, with whose guidance I had hoped to steer securely amid all the difficult shoals through which the course of a theologian must in these days probably be held".[2]

William Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ, or Antiquities of the English Ritual, with a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*, published in 1832, was partly an anticipation, partly a result of Bishop Lloyd's labours; that is to say, Mr. Palmer began

[1] *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, by F. Oakeley, pp. 13, 14.
[2] Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i. 202.

to write, or to collect materials for writing, his great work in Ireland, and migrated from Trinity College, Dublin, to Worcester College, Oxford, in order to have the benefit of the Oxford libraries. At Oxford he found Bishop Lloyd engaged in a similar work, and therefore abandoned his design; but when Bishop Lloyd died in 1829 with his work unfinished, Mr. Palmer was persuaded to resume his task, and to incorporate with it the results of Bishop Lloyd's labours. The *Origines* helped to remind those who had heard the lectures of what they had heard, and to inform others on the important subject; and thus the book must be regarded as a chief factor in the preparation for the movement which was fast approaching; for, "insisting upon the almost forgotten fact that the Prayer Book is mainly a translation from earlier office-books, and so represents the descent of the Reformed Church of England from the church of earlier days, it powerfully contributed to increase that devotion to the traditions of the church which characterized the Tracts".[1]

In indicating the preparations for the movement, we must not forget the impulse given to the study of early church history by Bishop Kaye, in his lectures at Cambridge, as Regius Professor of Divinity, on the early Fathers, which were afterwards enlarged and published. Bishop Kaye has been described as "the first to recall theological

[1] Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i. 264.

students to the study of the Fathers".[1] So far as he did this he must certainly be regarded as a pioneer of a movement which had for its object a return to primitive antiquity, though he was very far indeed from identifying himself with the later development of that movement.

If John Keble had died immediately after his publication of *The Christian Year* (1827), he too would have had to be regarded as a pioneer instead of a leader of the movement. The effect which that sweet work had in preparing the way has been described as none but Newman could have described it: "When the general tone of religious literature was so powerless and impotent as it was at that time, Keble struck an original note, and woke up in the hearts of thousands a new music, the music of a school long unknown in England".[2] But *The Christian Year* did not adequately represent the writer's later views. He himself said in 1845 that when he wrote *The Christian Year* he did not fully understand the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.[3] Dr. Pusey, indeed, "always held that the real source of the Oxford movement was to be found in *The Christian Year*";[4] and Mr. Lock says with perfect truth that "in it will be found nearly all the truths and the tone which came to the front in Tractarianism" (p. 71). Yes! they are *there*, but

[1] Article on "Kaye, John," in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.
[2] Newman's *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, p. 77.
[3] See Lock's *Keble*, p. 56. [4] Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i. 270.

they hardly *do* come to the front. In this work Keble did for the church revival very much what in a preceding generation Cowper did for the Evangelical revival. The poetry of both was saturated with their respective views, but these views were not prominently brought forward by either. You have certainly to read *The Christian Year* in the light of after events to find in it "the true and primary author" of the Oxford movement. But, when read thus, traces of him may be found. Thus, in the hymn for S. Matthias' Day the doctrine of Apostolical Succession is clearly traceable:—

"Who then, uncall'd by Thee,
Dare touch Thy Spouse, Thy very self below?
Or who dare count him summon'd worthily,
Except Thine hand and seal he show?
Where can Thy seal be found,
But on the chosen seed, from age to age
By Thine anointed heralds duly crown'd,
As kings and priests Thy war to wage?"

In the hymn for Holy Baptism, we have the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration:—

"A few calm words of faith and prayer,
A few bright drops of holy dew,
Shall work a wonder there
Earth's charmers never knew.

"Blest eyes, that see the smiling gleam
Upon the slumbering features glow,
When the life-giving stream,
Touches the tender brow."

In the hymn for the Tuesday in Whitsun-week we

have the duty of closely following out the church's system from Advent to Advent:—

"This is Thy pastoral course, O Lord,
Till we be sav'd, and Thou ador'd;—
Thy course and ours—but who are they
Who follow on the narrow way?

"And yet of Thee from year to year
The church's solemn chant we hear
As from Thy cradle to Thy throne
She swells her high heart-cheering tone.'

And once more, in the hymn for Trinity Sunday, we are taught to find an emblem of the Trinity in the three aisles of the church converging in the one chancel:—

"Three solemn parts together twine
In harmony's mysterious line;
Three solemn aisles approach the shrine;

"Yet all are One—together all
In thoughts that awe but not appal,
Teach the adoring heart to fall.

"Within these walls each fluttering guest
Is gently lur'd to one safe nest—
Without, 'tis moaning and unrest."

Moreover, Keble imperceptibly undermined that spirit of complacency with which it was the fashion of churchmen to regard their church as it was. "*The Christian Year*", as he himself says, "always supposes the church to be in a state of decay"; "and", adds his latest and best biographer, "he cannot acquiesce in a church so sluggish, so worldly, so utilitarian, because of the purity of his ideal.

. . . The whole volume is a dirge over the lost glory of the church; but it is much more than this, it is a trumpet-call to Christians to be true to the life which is in them, even though they may have to face the martyr's death."[1]

The same tone of sadness, mingled with an earnest appeal to churchmen to be up and doing, runs through the very striking set of sermons published in 1830, by one whose writings John Keble always admired and recommended, John Miller, of Worcester College. These sermons,[2] like their writer's Bampton Lectures of 1817, must have had the effect of making those who heard or read them feel not quite comfortable under the state of things as they were.

In a sketch like the present, it must suffice to give these brief indications (which do not pretend to be exhaustive) of the preparations for the movement. We must now pass on to the first stage of the movement itself.

Chapter II.

First Stage of the Movement (1833–1835).

Matters came to a climax on the introduction into Parliament in the early summer of 1833 of Mr.

[1] Lock's *Keble*, p 59.

[2] *Sermons intended to show a Sober Application of Scriptural Principles to the Realities of Life. With a Preface addressed to the clergy.* By John Miller, late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford.

(afterwards Lord) Stanley's Irish Temporalities Bill. The abolition of the church cess—a very unpopular method of collecting tithes—diminished greatly the income of the Irish Church; and to meet the deficiency the government proposed to suppress, on its own authority, two archbishoprics and ten bishoprics, that is, one-half of the whole Irish episcopate. Perhaps English churchmen hardly realized the extreme difficulty of the situation in which the government was placed; it had to devise *some* remedy for a state of things which seemed not unlikely to bring about a civil war in Ireland. But looking at it from their own point of view, they feared that what was done in Ireland might be done in England; and if bishoprics could be abolished by a purely secular authority, what would become of the doctrine of apostolical succession? So thought a little band of churchmen, mostly Oriel men, and they determined at once to take action. The reputation of Mr. Hugh James Rose naturally marked him out as their leader. Accordingly on July 6, 1833, we find Mr. Rose writing to Mr. Perceval that he was prevented from attending a meeting in London, but "can I not", he adds, "tempt you here?"—that is, to his rectory at Hadleigh in Suffolk. On July 10, Mr. Palmer writes to Mr. Perceval: "Our valued friend Rose has proposed a conference of friends on the state of affairs, and to consider of the line we ought to adopt. I think this most highly desirable. He has

asked me to go to Hadleigh, and gives me hopes of meeting you, which would be an exceeding pleasure. [Hurrell] Froude[1] has also expressed his intention of coming, and he says Keble will also. Newman we expect every day from the Continent, and I hope he will also be there. I would think of being at Hadleigh about this day fortnight if our other friends were then disengaged. Now I hope you will be able to join in this little plan and *conspiracy*; and when we are all met, it will be easy for us to consider and explain all things which might not be conveniently discussed in letters."

There is a singular interest in these details, trifling as they are in themselves; for the meeting, which duly took place, was in fact the nucleus of a movement which has revolutionized the Church of England.

But before "the fortnight" to which Mr. Palmer alludes had elapsed, another event occurred of primary importance. On July 14, 1833, John Keble preached an assize sermon at Oxford, which was published under the title of "National Apostacy". "I have ever considered", writes Newman, "and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833."[2] Perfectly calm and unimpassioned, yet outspoken to the utmost degree of boldness, refined and scholarly (of course), yet without the slightest

[1] For an account of this remarkable man see *infra*, p. 70.

[2] *Apologia*, ch. i. p. 35.

pretence at eloquence in the ordinary sense of the term, the sermon may disappoint the reader at the present day, as it disappointed Dean Burgon, who declares that "the sermon in question is by no means extraordinary".[1] Nor *was* it extraordinary in the sense in which the burning language of the dean's hero *par excellence*, Hugh James Rose, at Cambridge, was extraordinary. But, like all Keble's utterances, there was more effectiveness in it than the casual hearer or reader would realize. Applying the warning of the prophet Samuel to the people who had rejected God for their king, he pressed upon his hearers the duty of resisting a similar catastrophe. He did not scruple to declare boldly that England "as a Christian nation was a part of Christ's Church, and bound in all her legislation and policy by the fundamental laws of that church", and that if this principle was disavowed, it was a direct disavowal of the sovereignty of God. Then, in obvious reference to the late Irish measure, he asked, "If it be true that such enactments are forced on the legislature by public opinion, is apostasy too hard a word to describe the temper of such a nation?" In his peroration, he stirs up his hearers to take as active a part in public affairs as the duties of life would allow, and expresses the most absolute confidence in the final victory of the church. His closing words are worth quoting: "Public concerns, ecclesiastical or civil, will prove

[1] *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, i. 173.

indeed ruinous to those who permit them to occupy all their care and thought, neglecting or undervaluing ordinary duties, more especially those of a devotional kind. These cautions being duly observed, I do not see how any person can devote himself too entirely to the cause of the Apostolic Church in these realms. There may be, as far as he knows, but a very few to sympathise with him. He may have to wait long, and very likely pass out of this world before he see any abatement in the triumph of disorder and irreligion. But, if *he be consistent*, he possesses to the utmost the personal consolations of a good Christian; and as a true churchman, he has the encouragement which no other cause in the world can impart in the same degree: he is calmly, soberly, demonstrably *sure* that, sooner or later, *his will be the winning side*, and that the victory will be complete, universal, eternal."

The meeting at Hadleigh rectory took place on July 25, and lasted until July 29. There were only four clergymen present, Mr. Rose, the host, Mr. William Palmer, Mr. A. Perceval, brother of Lord Arden, and vicar of East Horsley, and Mr. Richard Hurrell Froude. Keble and Newman were unable to attend, but they were kept well posted up as to the proceedings, which were not very encouraging. The conference was to a great extent occupied in revising a tract entitled *The Churchman's Manual*, the composition of Mr. Perceval. Even the four

who met do not seem to have been agreed as to the remedy to be applied to the evils which all acknowledged. There is an interesting letter from Newman to Keble on the subject, dated Aug. 5, that is, a week after the conclusion of the conference: "Palmer has returned from Rose, and I have heard from Rose, as you probably have. Froude wishes to break with Rose, which must not be, I think. Let us wait the course of events. . . . I fear they did not get on very well at Hadleigh. Froude wants you to give your friend Arthur Perceval a bit of advice which I think Froude himself partly requires [against being prematurely violent]. Palmer thinks both Froude and Perceval very deficient in learning, and therefore rash."[1] To which Keble replies, Aug. 8: "If the Hadleighans could not agree when *inter quatuor muros*, will you find six men to agree together?"[2] Froude himself was evidently dissatisfied, for he writes to Perceval, Aug. 14, a letter, beginning: "The impression left on my mind by my visit to Rose was, on the whole, a gloomy one".[3]

The fact is, that Rose, Palmer, and, perhaps, Perceval on the one hand, Froude, Keble, and Newman on the other, represented, not exactly two different parties, but two different classes of mind. The former group were essentially conservative;

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, i. 439. [2] *Id.*, p. 441.
[3] *Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833*, p. 12.

they did not share the dissatisfaction with the *Church* as it was, which was so strongly felt by Keble, Newman, and Froude; they only desired to see it freed from what they regarded as the oppression of the State. They were very different types of men, Rose representing the brilliant and fascinating, Palmer the learned, and Perceval the aristocratic or territorial element. But none of them was prepared to follow what Newman calls the "go-ahead" course, for which he and Froude were ready, and from which Keble was not at all averse. The general object aimed at by the two groups was the same, but their views as to the right methods of attaining that object were very different, as will abundantly appear in the sequel. Which were right and which were wrong need not here be discussed; but, as a matter of fact, the movement was carried on by the latter, not by the former group. It is to this group, therefore, that the plan of this work requires us to turn; and in order to enable the reader to appreciate better what was afterwards done, it will be well to trace out the antecedents of the chief leaders of the group up to 1833.

Limiting our inquiries to this date, there can be no question who claims the first place. The order was afterwards twice reversed, but at the commencement the name of John Keble stands far above any other in connection with the movement. Indeed, to the very last he was distinctly recognized by the only other two who can at all come into competi-

tion with him, as their leader and their head. "The true and primary author", writes Newman, "was out of sight . . . Need I say that I allude to John Keble?"[1] And again, "I compared myself with Keble, and felt that I was merely developing his, not my, convictions". And again, "*You* [Keble] shall be censor of the tracts, but we will obey no one else".[2] When Dr. Liddon proposed in 1879 to write a history of the Oxford Movement, taking Pusey as the central figure, Dr. Pusey promised to help him to collect materials, "but the central figure", he added, "should be John Keble. . . . I should be glad to see it brought out, for J. K. was a mainspring."[3] Both Newman and Pusey constantly spoke of Keble as their spiritual father; and both—but especially Pusey—deferred submissively to his counsel in a very remarkable manner. What was there about this shy, homely, unambitious man to give him such a place in the greatest movement in the church since the Reformation? A brief sketch of the early lives of the three men, who were head and shoulders above all others connected with the movement, will perhaps enable us to answer the question,—at anyrate it will show us that the relationship between the three was a perfectly natural one.

John Keble (1792–1866) was the son of a country clergyman of Gloucestershire, and received a purely home education. He was never even at a private school. Up to the time of his going to Oxford he

[1] *Apologia*, ch. i. p. 17.
[2] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, i. 473.
[3] *Life of Pusey*, iv. 339.

was educated entirely by his father, a scholar and divine, whose theology was that of the Caroline divines in the seventeenth century and the Non-jurors in the eighteenth. His mother (*née* Maule) was of just the same school; so from his earliest years he had been trained in a definite church system, from which he never diverged, and had always breathed an atmosphere of culture and refinement. When he was elected to a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, of which his father had been scholar and fellow, at the early age of fourteen years and eight months, he was not drawn far into the vortex of university life; for the Corpus of those days had only about twenty undergraduates, all more or less scholarly, who lived chiefly within their own circle. After a brilliant undergraduate career he was elected fellow of Oriel, and was thus admitted at the age of nineteen into the most distinguished society Oxford could boast. He had carried all before him,—a scholarship (1806), a double first-class (1810), the most coveted of all fellowships (1811), and two University prizes, the Chancellor's essays, both English and Latin (1812).

After this his life for some years alternated between pastoral work in country cures and various work at Oxford. He was twice Public Examiner in the Classical School, from 1814 to 1816, and again from 1821 to 1823. He was for six years (1817–1823) College Tutor at Oriel, where he had to deal with the picked youth of the country as pupils, and in 1831 he was elected unanimously

Professor of Poetry, which of course only entailed occasional visits to Oxford. All the rest of his life was passed as a parochial clergyman in the country, but always amid congenial society and among the simple, rustic poor, contact with whom does not take off the fine edge of a man's mind, as perhaps contact with the class above them is apt to do; and he was always near his old home. His poetry is just what one would expect from such a career. Exquisitely delicate and refined thoughts, expressed in the most delicate and refined language, are its characteristics. Even the occasional roughness of versification may not be altogether unconnected with the absence of a public school education, when public schools laid excessive stress upon the form of composition, especially in verse. And his life in the country and love of the country are obviously factors in forming his poetical character. As Dean Stanley remarks: "Bagley Wood and the neighbourhood of Hursley might be traced through hundreds of lines in *The Christian Year*". In the words of his favourite poet:

> "His daily teachers had been woods and rills,
> The silence that is in the starry sky,
> The sleep that is among the lonely hills".

No town-bred man could have written *The Christian Year*, and no man could have written it who had not been encouraged by a pious home-training to study his Bible in a way that few school-boys did; for one of the features of the book is the Scriptural

knowledge, extending even to the scenery of Palestine, which it displays. Such was John Keble when he headed the movement of 1833.

Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800–1882) was born at Pusey in Berkshire, Aug. 22, 1800. His father, Philip Bouverie, youngest son of the first Viscount Folkestone, took the name of Pusey in 1789 when he succeeded to the Pusey estates. His mother was a daughter of the Earl of Harborough, and to her he owed his early religious training. "All that I know", he says, "about religious truth, I learnt, at least in principle, from my dear mother. But then, behind my mother, though of course I did not know it at the time, was the Catholic Church." "I was educated in the teaching of the Prayer-Book. . . . The doctrine of the Real Presence I learnt from my mother's explanation of the Catechism, which she had learned to understand from the older clergy."[1] In 1812 he went to Eton, from whence he proceeded in 1819 to Christ Church, Oxford, where he had a very high reputation as an undergraduate. "Shortly after I went to Oxford", writes Isaac Williams, "I heard of Pusey as a man who ought to have a first-class made for him by himself, he being so superior to everyone else in the mass of information he had acquired."[2] He justified these expectations by gaining a particularly good first-class in 1822; one of his examiners, G. Porter, "predicting his greatness, and regarding him as the man of the greatest ability

[1] Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, i. 7. [2] *Autobiography of I. Williams*, p. 25.

he had ever examined or known".[1] In 1823 he was elected fellow of Oriel, and in 1824 won the Chancellor's prize for the best Latin essay. He was persuaded by Dr. Lloyd to spend two years (1825–1827) in Germany, "to study the language and theology of the Germans". There he made the acquaintance of several of the most famous German professors, and was impressed with the fact that English churchmen were quite unprepared to grapple with the bold speculations of the Germans. Soon after his return to England (1827) he published his first book, *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany*. It was an answer to a course of lectures delivered at Cambridge by Hugh James Rose on the subject; but it is a mistake to suppose that Rose took the orthodox and Pusey the rationalistic side. They both agreed on the main question. "We ought", he wrote to Rose ten years later, "to have been fighting side by side instead of with each other." But Pusey thought—and with very good reason—that he perceived a tendency in England to combat rationalism in exactly the same inadequate ways in which it had been unsuccessfully combated in Germany, and he naturally feared the same disastrous result. German pietism corresponded closely with English evangelicalism; and German "orthodoxism", as he terms it, with the rather stiff, wooden, inelastic

[1] See Liddon's *Life*, p. 32. Mr. Porter made the remark to the learned Canon A. S. Farrar of Durham.

attitude of English "orthodoxy". Both lived to regret their "German war". Rose wrote generously: "I wish we had known each other personally, and I am sure it would never have taken place. I should have profited by your very far superior knowledge of the subject, and should have done the work of warning the English student more effectually." Pusey "was dissatisfied with his books [he wrote two], and withdrew from circulation what remained of them".[1] These books were misunderstood; some thought that he was a rationalist, others that he was an evangelical, on account of his expressions of sympathy with the German pietists. Perhaps the fact that he was not ordained deacon until 1828, after he had written the books, helped to make men think that his opinions were unsettled.

When he became a candidate for the Hebrew chair in 1828, Archdeacon Cambridge, a leading high churchman, informed him that "some dignitaries thought him latitudinarian, but he himself acquitted him of the charge". Pusey wrote to his constant friend Bishop Lloyd (Oct. 1828), "I believe that practically my opinions are those of the High Church; that, however I may respect individuals, I feel myself more and more removed from what is called Low Church. I do not know any subject of controversy between High and Low in which I do not agree with the former." Bishop Lloyd was satisfied that he was "quite unlikely to cause serious anxiety on the score of rationalism or even latitudinarianism",

[1] Liddon, i. 175.

and mainly through Lloyd's exertions, as Pusey himself gratefully recognized, he was elected to the professorship. But the rather doubtful way in which the bishop expresses himself shows that Pusey was at least a suspected person; and in 1829 those who were suspicious of him were probably not a little confirmed in their suspicions by the fact that he ranged himself with Whately and Blanco White, as a supporter of Sir R. Peel, in the famous election when that great man lost his seat, while his friends Keble, Newman, Froude, and R. Wilberforce were in the opposite camp. This, however, was a political, or at most a politico-ecclesiastical, not a theological question. But the suspicion remained. Writing about the commencement of the movement, Palmer says: "Pusey we knew nothing of; he was supposed to be favourable to the innovating party; he did not join the Association, and only became connected with the cause when Newman had become leader."[1] The fact is undoubted; Pusey never opposed, but he held aloof from the movement at first, and there is an interesting letter written by him to his wife in 1835, which certainly implies that he was at any rate not quite steady in his convictions at the time of "the German war". "I see", he writes, "many reasons why John's [Newman's] statement of truth should be attractive, mine repulsive. He has held a steady course, I have not. I studied evidences when I should have

[1] *Narrative of Events*, &c., Introduction, p. 50.

been studying the Bible; I was dazzled with the then rare acquaintance with German theology, and over-excited by it, &c."[1]

The "John" of this letter introduces us to the third member of the trio, whose early history, however, does not quite bear out what his friend says of him.

John Henry Newman (1801–1890), unlike the other two, received his first religious impressions from the Evangelical school. He was the eldest of the six children of John Newman, a banker in the city of London, and Jemima his wife, who was a member of a well-known Huguenot family called Foudrinier, which had long been settled in London. The mother directed the course which Newman's early religion took, and, as might be expected from a descendant of the Huguenots, it was an evangelical direction. He was taught to take a delight in reading the Bible, and to expect an inward conversion. When he was fifteen years of age the longed-for event took place, the chief instrument of his conversion being a pious clergyman, Walter Mayers, a classical master in the private school at Ealing where he was educated. Of its reality, he writes, long after he had drifted away into quite a different course, "I am still more certain than that I have hands and feet".[2] He was deeply impressed by evangelical writers, such as William Romaine, Joseph Milner, Daniel Wilson, and above all,

[1] Liddon, ii. 87. [2] *Apologia*, p. 4.

Thomas Scott, "to whom", he writes "(humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul";[1] and in 1816 he went up to Trinity College, Oxford, a decided Evangelical. He does not appear to have been at all shaken in these views during his undergraduate days. He was a hard reader, and was judiciously directed in his reading by his college tutor, the well-known Thomas Short. But by one of those strange slips which occasionally occur, he was about as unsuccessful in the schools as an industrious scholar of Trinity could well be. He read for a double first, but the result was that in the classical list, his name appeared in the lowest class (a second below the line), and in the mathematical, not at all —that is, he was "gulfed". Various circumstances, into which it is unnecessary to enter, sufficiently account for his failure. He was not disheartened; he was still conscious of his powers, and boldly aimed at the highest distinction within his reach— a fellowship at Oriel. He was elected on April 12, 1822, a day which he "ever felt the turning-point of his life, and of all days most memorable". But at Oriel "there was that real isolation of thought and spiritual loneliness which were the result of his Calvinistic beliefs".[2] In 1824 he was ordained deacon, and took the curacy of the Evangelical Church of S. Clement's, Oxford, of course residing in college, and there coming under the influence of

[1] *Apologia*, p. 5.

[2] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*—Autobiography, i. 104.

powerful minds. "During two years of parochial duty at S. Clement's Mr. Newman underwent a great change in his religious opinions, brought about by various influences. The atmosphere of the Oriel common-room was one; its members, together with its distinguished head [Copleston], being as remarkable for the complexion of their theology, and their union among themselves in it, as for their literary eminence. . . . They were neither High nor Low Church, but had become a new school, characterized by its spirit of moderation and comprehension, and of which the principal ornaments were Copleston, Davison, Whately, Hawkins, and Arnold."[1] They were, in fact, the Oriel "Noetics", the forerunners of the Oxford liberals. But, strange to say, he also learnt from them some of the chief doctrines which he afterwards held as a Tractarian. From Whately—of all men in the world—"he found on looking back that he had learned one momentous truth of Revelation, and that was the idea of the Christian Church as a Divine appointment, and as a substantive, visible body, independent of the State, and endowed with rights, prerogatives, and powers of its own".[2] Hawkins "gave me", he says, "the *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching*, by Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury [an Evangelical!], from which I was led to give up my remaining Calvinism, and to receive the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration".[3] The influence of Whately lasted

[1] *Apologia*, i. 114. [2] *Id.*, p. 109. [3] *Id.*, p. 9.

for four years (1822–1826), but it was (except on the point above-mentioned) a negative rather than a positive influence. It succeeded in detaching him from evangelicalism, but it never really succeeded in drawing him towards the liberalism of which Whately was the ablest exponent. He tells us, indeed, that at one time he "was beginning to prefer intellectual influence to moral; and was drifting in the direction of the liberalism of the day";[1] but this was quickly stayed by illness and bereavement. When Whately became principal of S. Alban Hall in 1825 he made Newman vice-principal and tutor; and the two men were of course thrown much together. But they were so different that they could not be really intimate; and the parliamentary election of 1829, which unseated Peel, dissolved what intimacy there was. Newman naturally found his closest friends at Oriel among men nearer his own standing. In 1823 he says, "I had the intimacy of my dear and true friend Dr. Pusey, and could not fail to admire and revere a soul so devoted to the cause of religion, so full of good works, so faithful in his affections; but he left residence when I was getting to know him well".[2] He then attached himself to two younger fellows, Robert Isaac Wilberforce and Richard Hurrell Froude. These friendships would more than counterbalance the influence of Whately in a different direction; and Froude, in especial, had a power over him which a

[1] *Apologia*, p. 14. [2] *Id.*, p. 16.

younger man rarely exercises over an elder. It was Froude, too, who brought Newman and Keble together. They had hitherto kept rather apart. Keble (in Newman's opinion) "was shy of him in consequence of the marks he bore of the evangelical and liberal schools".[1] Newman regarded Keble as a sort of awful being, to be admired only at a respectful distance. But Froude prided himself in having brought the two to understand each other, about the year 1828.

Newman had by this time drifted away from evangelicalism, but he had hardly entered into the true spirit of the English Church. In fact, from first to last, he never *did* enthusiastically admire that church;—he saw her abuses, and he ardently set himself to reform them; but she was never his true mother, as she always was Keble's. He contrasted her with the Primitive Church, on which his attention was engaged while writing his *History of the Arians*, much to her disadvantage. After having dwelt mournfully on the evil effects of liberalism, and the weakness of evangelicalism in the church, he writes: "With the establishment thus divided and threatened, thus ignorant of its true strength, I compared that fresh vigorous Power of which I was reading in the first centuries. In her triumphant zeal on behalf of that Primeval Mystery, to which I had so great a devotion from my youth, I recognized the movement of my

[1] *Apologia*, p. 18.

Spiritual Mother, '*Incessu patuit Dea*'. The self-conquest of her Ascetics, the patience of her Martyrs, the irresistible determination of her Bishops, the joyous swing of her advance, both exalted and abashed me. I said to myself, 'Look on this picture and on that'; I felt affection for my own church, but not tenderness; I felt dismay at her prospects, anger and scorn at her do-nothing perplexity."[1]

The fact is, Newman had never had a fair chance of seeing the church's system at work; his antecedents, as sketched above, show this plainly enough. A singularly interesting article in *The Christian Remembrancer*, written by one who knew him well, immediately after his secession, expressed this very forcibly: "Has Mr. Newman ever had what could be called a natural mental position in our church? Has he ever been her son? If he has, he has not done himself justice in his own way of speaking of her position; he has represented it as more external than it really was. He wants a larger body to belong to; the English Church is too small. He tries her system as an experiment. His own work was in a way external to himself all the time. There was a reserve going on; he was not one with his church; he was not at home in her; he had not faith in her. . . . He was in the midst of a circle of Church of England friends [that is, at Oriel]; the movement had a pre-existence in them; he took it from them. He was their convert originally, not

[1] *Apologia*, p. 31.

their teacher. It spread rapidly with his powerful aid; but alas! the support was had, not the supporter."[1] It is fair to add that Newman's sister, Harriet (Mrs. T. Mozley), writes to her brother-in-law, J. B. Mozley, the writer of the article: "There was a time, before you knew J. H. N., when he had a thorough attachment to our church, which you do not give him credit for"[2]—but when that time was, does not appear. At any rate, it was with anything but "a thorough attachment to our church" that he set forth, with R. H. Froude, and his father, Archdeacon Froude, in December, 1832, on his Mediterranean tour; and when he returned, with a firm conviction that "he had a work to do in England", he found himself on the very verge of the movement with which his name is inseparably connected.

From the summer of 1833 the history of the church revival *is* the history of its three great leaders; the future events of their lives will come in naturally in the course of the narrative. But this little sketch of their antecedents will, it is hoped, enable the reader to see why it was that the other two paid so marked a deference to John Keble. Far inferior to Pusey in learning, and to Newman in genius, Keble possessed qualifications which would at once lead them to recognize him as their guide. In the first place,

[1] "The Recent Schism", Art. vi. in No. 51 of *The Christian Remembrancer*, for January, 1846.

[2] *Letters of J. B. Mozley*, ed. by his sister, p. 174.

he was eight or nine years their senior; and years almost count as generations at Oxford. Newman had from the first an uncomfortable feeling that he and his friends were taking a prominent position which was unbecoming the modesty of young men. But Keble had won his spurs at an unusually early age, and Newman had heard of him as "the first man in Oxford" years before the movement began. Thomas Mozley, who was by no means an indiscriminate admirer of John Keble, says of him: "He was present (1828) in everybody's thoughts, as a glory to the college, a comfort and a stay, for the slightest word he dropped was all the more remembered from there being so little of it, and from it seeming to come from a different and holier sphere".[1]

And not only was he the first man in reputation, but he was the first man who "turned the tide, and brought the talent of Oxford to the side of the old theology" (*Apologia*, p. 289), which would of course give him an additional claim to the reverence of Newman and Pusey. Again, Keble had been throughout fixed and steady in his convictions, which Newman had not been at all, and Pusey only in a very qualified sense. And yet, though from first to last a thorough high churchman, he differed from the main body of the high churchmen of the day in being free from that spirit of optimism, that complacency in the church as it was, which exasperated

[1] *Reminiscences*, &c., vol. i. ch. v. p. 37.

Newman beyond measure. When *The Christian Year* "always supposed the church to be in a state of decay", it thoroughly reflected the habitual tone of its writer. And once more, Keble, though personally humble and diffident to a fault ("If you want to get anything in the way of plain counsel from dear John Keble", said Pusey, many years later, "you really must be on your guard against his humility"[1])—was bold as a lion when a principle was at stake. "Keble is at length roused," writes Newman, just before the movement, "and (if once up) he will prove a second Ambrose."[2] How truly he estimated the man will appear in the narrative to which, after this not unnecessary digression, we now return.

After the Hadleigh meeting the two sections of the movement to a certain extent agreed that tracts should be issued to insense people on church subjects, and that an association should be formed to combine church people together; though one section never took kindly to the tracts, nor the other to the association. However, "An Association of the Friends of the Church" was formed, the objects of which are thus stated:—

"1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the church—that is, to withstand all change which involves the denial or suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practices in religious offices, or innovation upon

[1] *Life of Pusey*, i. 441. [2] Quoted by Mr. Lock, p. 78.

the Apostolical prerogative, orders and commission of bishops, priests, and deacons.

"2. To afford churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments and co-operating together on a large scale."[1]

The Association was short-lived, Froude (who at this time had immense influence over Newman, and therefore over the section which Newman represented) being "strongly against any society or association other than the church itself", and impressing his views upon others.[2] But before it became defunct, it effected at least one most important measure. It elicited a very unexpected and general expression of an attachment to the church, and a fixed determination not to see the national church destroyed or even weakened; and it thus showed that the jubilancy of the church's foes, and the despondency of her friends, were quite misplaced. This was done, first through an "Address to the Primate", drawn up at the instance of, and by, Palmer, which was eagerly signed by seven thousand or more of the clergy, and presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth in the early part of 1834. It expressed a deep attachment to the church, but in rather vague and general terms—even so moderate a churchman as Archdeacon Froude called it "milk and water". It was followed by a "Declaration of the Laity", drawn up

[1] See Palmer's *Narrative*, &c., ch. vi. p. 49, and Perceval's *Collection*, &c., p. 18.

[2] See Perceval, p. 18.

by Joshua Watson, and expressing the same sentiments, but rather more definitely, which was signed with even more eagerness by no less than two hundred and thirty thousand heads of families.

All this showed that there was plenty of material for what would now be called "church defence"; but it did not show that there was an adequate knowledge of church principles. To supply and disseminate this knowledge was the object of the "Tracts for the Times". "It had been unanimously agreed", writes Mr. Palmer, "amongst those who originated the movement, that the press ought to be made the means of bringing before the clergy and laity the great principles on which the church is based, and which had been almost wholly forgotten. . . . We were anxious to impress upon them that the church was more than a merely human institution; that it had privileges, sacraments, a ministry ordained by Christ."[1] But they were not so unanimously agreed about the methods to be adopted for bringing about this result. Mr. Palmer, who, owing to the failing health of Mr. Rose, and his removal to the then remote Durham, became the recognized leader of the old-fashioned, conservative wing of the movement, was for doing nothing without general consultation: the tracts were all to be revised and put forth by a committee. Mr. Newman, who from this time forth drew ahead and became by far the most important and influential

[1] *Narrative*, &c., p. 119.

factor in the movement for the next eight or nine years, was for leaving each tract-writer absolutely free and unfettered. "If you correct them", he argued, "according to the wishes of a board, you will have nothing but tame, dull compositions, which will take no one."[1] "Individuals who are seen and heard, who act and suffer, are the instruments of Providence in all great successes. There is an awkwardness in tracts coming from a society. It is an assumption of teaching. And further, they must in consequence be weighed and carefully corrected; and thus they become cold and formal and (so to say) impersonal. An address with much in it which others question, yet coming from an individual mind, has life about it which is seen to make an impression. . . . You will see I am for no committee, secretaries, &c., but merely for certain individuals, in every part of the country, in correspondence with each other, instructing and encouraging each other, and acting with all their might in their respective circles."[2] It was Newman, again, who insisted upon it that Oxford, not London, should be the centre of the movement. "Universities are the natural centres of intellectual movements."[3] "I do not think we have yet made as much as we ought of our situation at Oxford, and of the deference paid to it throughout the country."[4] "When-

[1] Letter to Keble, Nov. 1833. *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, p. 463. [2] *Id.*, pp. 466, 468. Newman to Palmer, Oct. 1833.
[3] *Apologia*, p. 39. [4] Newman to Keble, Aug. 5, 1833. *Letters*, &c., p. 440.

ever you talk of the tracts, mind and persist they are not connected with the Association, but the production of 'Residents in Oxford'. I wish them called the 'Oxford Tracts', but I cannot myself so call them for modesty's sake. So I think that soon I shall advertise them as 'Tracts for the Times, by residents in Oxford', which, of course, will soon be corrupted into 'Oxford Tracts'."[1]

Looking back after an interval of more than sixty years, it appears to me that Mr. Newman was not only right on both points, but that upon his insistence on them hinged the whole success of the movement. With the intuitive insight of genius he caught at once the secret of the strength of his position, and Mr. Palmer himself afterwards generously owned it. "Perhaps", he says, "a committee would have imposed a far greater restraint than I should have been conscious of, or designed";[2] and he fully admits the greater influence of the Tracts than of the Association.[3]

It was on September 9, 1833, that Newman burst forth in print with his first tract. It is entitled *Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission, respectfully addressed to the Clergy*. He plunges at once *in medias res* with the now memorable words: "I am but one of yourselves—a Presbyter, and there-

[1] Newman to Bowden, Nov. 1833. *Letters*, &c., p. 483, 484.

[2] *Narrative*, &c., p. 123.

[3] *Id., Preface.* A parallel instance may be found in a different kind of warfare. The will of one general is always more full of force than the decision of a committee. A council of war generally advises prudence or even retreat in face of difficulties.

fore I conceal my name lest I should take too much on myself by speaking in my own person. Yet speak I must, for the times are very evil, yet no one speaks against them", and then he proceeds to dwell on the Apostolical Succession as the only real ground on which the clergy can base their claims. No. 2, on *The Catholic Church*, and No. 3, *On Alterations in the Liturgy*,[1] bear the same date, and are by the same hand; they are mere leaflets, but well calculated to rouse those to whom they are addressed; and they thoroughly bear out the principle of the motto of the series, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" So too do No. 4 (September 21), *Adherence to the Apostolical Succession the safest course*, and No. 5 (October 18), but they are evidently by different hands. No. 4 is by John Keble, No. 5 by "a layman", that is, J. W. Bowden, Newman's early and very intimate friend, whom he calls "Apostolicorum Princeps". When four tracts had appeared, Newman was cheered by a most encouraging letter from Rose, of whom he always had the very highest opinion: "Your tracts are excellent, and *not too strong*. They will, I think, tell better if *separate*." All through the autumn of 1833 the tracts came out in rapid succession, many written by Newman himself, and all under his inspiration.

The key-note of the early tracts is the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession; all else is subservient

[1] Quoted by Burgon, i. 196.

to, and flows from, this doctrine. On the supreme importance of insistence upon it, both sections of the movement were thoroughly at one. The three leaders of the conservative section, Rose, Palmer, and Perceval, all wrote decidedly on this point.[1] Before the plan of writing tracts had taken a definite shape this doctrine had come to the front, for we find Keble writing to his friend Dyson, on August 26, 1832, telling him that there were thoughts of forming "a kind of association", the first object of which was to be "the inculcation of primitive notions regarding the Apostolical Succession",[2] and accordingly it was the burden of the first tract. The doctrine has of course always been an essential part of high church theology, but the unique importance now attached to it was due to the supposed exigencies of the times. There was, as we have seen, a strong feeling abroad that the State was about to "cast off" the Church; on what, then, were the clergy to rest their claim of respect and attention from their flocks? They must go back to the real ground on which their authority was built. Christ gave His Spirit to His apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them, and these again on others, and so the sacred gift was handed down to the present bishops. This was the doctrine of the ordination service; if they rested

[1] See Appendix to Rose's *Commission and consequent Duties of the Clergy*; Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, esp. vol. i. ch. viii. pp. 132-145; and Perceval's *Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession*.

[2] Coleridge's *Memoirs*, p. 212.

upon this they were on an impregnable basis, but if they rested upon the State support, or upon any secular advantages which they might possess, they were resting on a broken reed, which might fail them any day. Hence the party called themselves "Apostolicals".

Meanwhile the more conservative wing of the movement observed with dismay how rapidly things were going ahead, and how Newman was carrying all before him. "The movement", writes Mr. Palmer, "suddenly found itself Tractarian; that is, informed, guided, and presided over by Newman alone." He complains, not unnaturally, that the tracts were everywhere called, not "Newman's Tracts", but "Oxford Tracts", and that "the whole Association became responsible for their contents, though they were really the expression of Newman's opinions, and those of his friends or disciples whom he chose to associate with him in his Tracts". The excellent H. H. Norris, the clerical head of the old High Church party, strongly agreed with Palmer, and appears to have imagined that that party had succeeded in putting a stop to the tracts; for we find Hurrell Froude writing to Newman in November, 1833: "As to giving up the tracts, the notion is odious. Norris writes to my father to announce that the tract system (he was happy to say) was abandoned. We must throw the Z's[1] overboard;

[1] "The Z's" was the cant name by which the Tractarians designated the "orthodox", the Evangelicals being "the peculiars", and themselves "the apostolicals".

they are a small and, as my father says, daily diminishing party. He is much inclined to them himself, but will take trouble to circulate the tracts."[1]

But, in this case, Newman did not require to be "kept up to the mark by Froude". He had no intention of giving up the tracts, nor of altering their character, to please anybody. He writes to his friend, Bowden, this same month (November, 1833): "We shall go on printing and circulating through our own friends, though the High Church party wish us to stop tracts altogether. By us I mean Keble, myself, Froude, and our friends, who are more or less the following (though not associated or bound together by any law; that is, many people like naturally their own way): Pusey and Harrison, Ch. Ch. (they must not be numbered as of our party); Williams of Trinity; Christie, Rogers, Mozley, and the Wilberforces of Oriel; Thomas Keble, Prevost, Rickards, Sale of Magdalen, Rose, Perceval, Golightly, Dyson, &c. Palmer, backed by Norris, &c., is afraid of tracts, and wishes them stopped, and is aiming at an association. I say let every man employ his talent in his own way. Let there be an association, if they can do it, and we will be members of it, to avoid the appearance of schism. Still, why not also go on with tracts? Until I see reason, I must. Perhaps Keble will be proclaimed our editor." Newman must have been

[1] Newman's *Letters*, &c., p. 484.

rather sanguine when he wrote the above names of his adherents. He could hardly count upon *all* "the Wilberforces of Oriel"; Golightly soon became the bitterest and most effective of all the opponents of the movement; "Sale of Magdalen", afterwards the respected vicar of Sheffield, was never regarded as a Newmanite; Perceval was certainly more inclined to the Palmer section; and to Rickards, Newman had to write very soon after: "As to your criticisms, I have been too busy to answer them. *The Association has nothing to do with the tracts.* The latter are the work of Oxford; Keble, myself, and others are answerable for them. . . . We will take advice and thank you; we will thank you for cuffs; but we will take our own line according to the light given us by Almighty God and His Holy Church."[1] In December, 1833, he writes to Froude more hopefully still: "Our demand increases. Thomas Keble, Harrison, Menzies, Perceval, and a more important friend who at present is nameless, have written for us; John Miller, Copeland, and Williams are also writing."[2] The mysterious friend who is nameless is of course Pusey.

And so the tracts went on all through 1834, and towards the close of that year forty-six of them were collected and published in one volume, with a remarkable preface, or, as it is called, "advertisement". They were energetically pushed by friends

[1] *Letters*, &c., i. p. 490. [2] *Id.*, ii. 8.

of the movement riding about the country and distributing them, especially among the clergy. Newman himself took an active part in this personal canvass, and so did his brother-in-law, Thomas Mozley. But this method of making them known was not needed long. The tracts made their own way, and that as much by the hostility as by the sympathy which they evoked. The Tractarians adopted the very wise policy of "offering no reply to the numberless attacks made on them, but trusting to the strength of principles and internal force of truth".[1] The novelty of the situation attracted attention. Tracts had of course long been a vehicle by which men and parties propagated their views. Wesley had had his tracts; the Evangelicals inside and outside the National Church had had their Religious Tract Society for more than thirty years, which had disseminated a vast amount of such literature. But tracts by the highest of High Churchmen, tracts, not only written but circulated, by Oxford dons, and dons of the most intellectual and fastidious college at Oxford, were a new thing. Incidents ludicrous enough occurred during the process of circulation. One old clergyman, when Newman presented himself on his missionary enterprise at the country parsonage, asked him suspiciously whether Whately was not at the bottom of it all! Another (a bishop!), having read the earlier tracts, which were all more or less on the

[1] Palmer's *Narrative*, &c., p. 66.

subject of the Apostolical Succession, could not quite make up his mind whether he believed it or not! Another gravely wrote to a newspaper pointing out a misprint in one of the tracts: it had spoken of the "Eucharistic *sacrifice*", which of course was a printer's error for the "Eucharistic *sacrament*"!

Such incidents, trifling as they may seem, are important as illustrating the bewilderment and alarm of old-fashioned minds at the strange things that were going on. But that was just what was intended. The "advertisement" to vol. iii. (dated "Feast of All Saints", 1836), contrasting the marked difference in length, style, and tone, between the tracts before and the tracts after the summer of 1835, says of the earlier: "They spontaneously used the language of alarm and complaint. They were written, as a man might give notice of a fire or inundation, to startle all who heard him, with only so much of doctrine and argument as might be necessary to account for their publication, or might answer more obvious objections to the views therein advocated."[1] The change in the character of the tracts marks a new phase of the movement, which will be best described in a new chapter.

But Newman, besides being the life and soul of the tracts, was pushing on the movement in another, and at least as effective a way. In 1834 he published his first volume of *Parochial Sermons*; and according

[1] *Reminiscences*, vol. i. ch. xlix. p. 316.

to Mr. T. Mozley, "the publishers said that the volume put all other sermons out of the market, just as *Waverley* and *Guy Mannering* put all other novels".[1] And no wonder, when we remember that they were the famous Sunday afternoon sermons preached at S. Mary's. They had been going on since 1828, when Newman succeeded Hawkins as vicar of the Oriel living of S. Mary's. But of course after the start of the movement they had an additional significance. Not that they often dwelt directly upon those doctrines which it was the object of the movement to propagate; they were essentially practical rather than doctrinal. But with Newman a religion which did not rest upon dogma was no religion at all; and the undergraduates and graduates who listened breathlessly to them had quite sense enough to perceive the dogma behind the practical advice. The service, coming at a most inconvenient hour for university men (4 p.m.), and being, in fact, not intended for them, was not crowded; but those who *did* attend were the picked men—the most earnest and thoughtful of the future clergymen, statesmen, and men of letters—and they carried away with them into all parts of the country ineffaceable impressions not only of the sermons but of the preacher, whose personality was even more impressive than his sermons—great as the sermons are, even when read in cold blood by those who never saw the preacher. "Without

[1] *Reminiscences*, &c., vol. i. ch. xlix. p. 316.

those sermons, the movement might never have gone on, certainly would never have been what it was."[1] "The sermons at S. Mary's were the commentaries on the Tracts."[2]

Chapter III.

Second Stage of the Movement (1835–1839).

In the summer of 1835 a crisis arose in the history of the Tracts. Newman writes in a desponding tone to Hurrell Froude: "The Tracts are defunct or *in extremis*. Rivington has written to say they do not answer. Pusey has written one on Baptism, very good, of ninety pages, which is to be printed at his risk. That and one or two to finish the imperfect series (on particular subjects) will conclude the whole. I am not sorry, as I am tired of being editor."

The final adhesion, however, of Dr. Pusey to the movement, which took place at this time, not only gave a new lease of life to the Tracts, but marks an altogether new era in their history. Not that Pusey had before this in any way disapproved of what his friends were doing, nor, indeed, had entirely stood aloof from their work. As early as 1833 he had written a tract (No. 18, on Fasting),[3] stipulating, however, that he should attach his initials to it, to

[1] Dean Church, *Oxford Movement*, ch. vii. p. 113. [2] *Id.*, ch. viii. 131.
[3] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ii. 124.

show that he was only responsible for his own composition; and in the same year, in a letter to his brother, he animadverted, with as much indignation as his gentle nature was capable of showing, upon what he considered a wrong-headed criticism of the early Tracts in the *Christian Observer*. "It has wholly mistaken the object, which is wholly directed to things spiritual, and has nothing to do with the temporals of the Church."[1] But he can scarcely be said to have thoroughly identified himself with the movement until the publication of his three tracts on Holy Baptism, the first of which (No. 67) appeared on S. Bartholomew's Day, the second (No. 68) on Michaelmas Day, the third (No. 69) on S. Luke's Day, 1835. The three together, with subsequent enlargements, formed a bulky and most elaborate and exhaustive treatise on the subject.

Pusey's adherence was an instance of the right man coming in just at the right time. The public had now been fairly aroused; they had had sufficiently impressed upon them the duty of maintaining Church principles; they had now a right to demand that those principles should be fully and definitely explained to them in detail. The time for short, stirring appeals was over; the time for solid, sober treatises on divinity had arrived; and Pusey was better qualified for this department of the work than any other member of the group. Palmer[2] can scarcely

[1] Quoted in *Life of Pusey*, i. 278.

[2] That is, of course, William Palmer, the writer of the *Treatise on the*

be reckoned a member. Routh, though agreeing in the main, never dreamed of entering the arena; Rose was far away in the remote north, and no one else could be compared to Pusey for extent and depth of reading. Moreover, his mild and conciliatory spirit introduced a healing element into the movement which was certainly needed. The "fierceness" (to use his own expression) of Newman, and especially of Newman when "kept up to the mark by Froude",[1] had the very natural effect of raising opposition; and even in Keble—the gentle, humble Keble—there was a strong spice, if not exactly of fierceness, yet of a tendency to give vent to the most unpopular sentiments in the most uncompromising way, without the slightest attempt to tone them down. Pusey, again, was far more apt to recognize two sides of a question than was Keble, Newman, or Froude. Moreover, as Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, he had a definite status in the University; and this, besides giving weight to the cause, perhaps also led him to see the necessity of measuring his words.

By no one has his place in the movement been

Church of Christ, who is so often referred to in these pages. It is rather confusing that there were two William Palmers connected with the Oxford High Churchmen—(1) William Palmer of Magdalen, the archæologist, brother of Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), who went over to Rome; (2) William Palmer of Worcester College, who used sometimes to be called "Worcester Palmer", to distinguish him from the other. Unless otherwise specified, "Palmer" in this volume always means "Worcester Palmer".

[1] Froude and Ward were both "fiercer" than Newman; but Froude was now virtually dying, and Ward had not yet come upon the scene.

better described than by one, with whom he never quite agreed, and who, while he was still in the English Church, certainly belonged to the Newman rather than to the Pusey section of the movement. "Dr. Pusey's moderation", writes Mr. Oakeley, "did much valuable service to the movement. He was, as Mr. Newman was not, a high dignitary of the Established Church, a person of aristocratic birth and high connections." [Then follows a quite unnecessary fling at the Church which the writer had left.] "He was the only member of the Tractarian school to whom the Evangelical party had any kind of attraction. His piety was not only most real, but it was of a popular and impressive character. He had also a way peculiarly his own, and entirely consistent with sincerity and simplicity, of rounding off the sharp edges of the strong and offensive statements of others, and thus presenting them under a far less odious aspect to those who disliked them. Hence Dr. Pusey had a definite and most important place in the movement. While it was Mr. Newman's office to stimulate, and his misfortune to startle, to Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, belonged the work of soothing and the ministry of conciliation. He was the S. Barnabas of the movement."[1]

I quote this rather than the splendid and touching passage on the subject in Newman's *Apologia*, partly because it is less known, and partly because the characteristic generosity with which Newman recog-

[1] *Historic Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, by F. Oakeley, pp. 48–49.

nizes the invaluable services of Pusey, might lead the general reader to suppose that the latter became at once a more important personage in the movement than the former. This was not so. Newman still continued to be far and away the most influential leader. He had qualifications for the post which neither Pusey nor anyone else possessed to anything like the same extent. Again, I cannot do better than quote Mr. Oakeley: "In actual hold upon others there was no comparison between the two. Pusey's power over consciences was limited by the degree of his disciples' obedience; Newman's penetrated and swayed them in spite both of themselves and himself" (*Id.*, p. 69). It should be added that there was not the slightest rivalry or jealousy between the two men; they worked together harmoniously, each in his own way, with Keble in the background as a sort of final court of appeal for both,—a *Deus ex machina*, invariably to be called in when, and only when, a knot worthy of such a champion occurred.

Considering the characters of the two men, it is not surprising that Newman's influence over individuals should have been greater than Pusey's. He was far less reserved with his intimate friends; the social and domestic element was much stronger in him; at the same time he was less intelligible to the outer world, and for that very reason the more attractive to the inner circle of which he formed the centre. Pusey was no mystery; he was simply the student, the scholar, and the saint, a person to be regarded

with reverential awe, but not to be approached too nearly, except as an oracle to be consulted. Newman had his lighter and more unrestrained mood, (which, however, was always checked in the presence of Pusey); men were drawn to him, and learned to regard him with an enthusiastic devotion, imitating his very voice and gestures,—which nobody ever thought of doing in the case of Pusey. He was not more warm-hearted,—for Pusey had a very warm heart—but he certainly wore more his heart upon his sleeve. Perhaps also the poetic element, which was so conspicuous in Newman's character, and was wanting in Pusey's, tended to increase the fascination of the former. Newman was restless, startling, brilliant; Pusey calm, staid, and dignified; and to young minds especially, such as most of those who joined the early movement, the former type was naturally the more taking of the two.

Having thrown himself heart and soul into the cause, Dr. Pusey at once began to project various schemes to promote it in the way which seemed to him most essential, that is, in the way of theological study. He formed a *Theological Society*, which was at first intended to be confined to no party in the Church. Men were invited to join who had no sympathy with the founders' views; but these either declined or soon withdrew; and the Society became as much a part of the movement as the Tracts themselves. Indeed it was one of the chief means by which the Tracts were kept up in their new shape.

The members met in Dr. Pusey's house, when one of them would read a paper on some theological subject; and then the paper would appear, sometimes altered and greatly enlarged, either as a "Tract for the Times" or in the *British Magazine*. Isaac Williams' views on Reserve and John Keble's on Mysticism, of which we shall hear more presently, were first expressed in papers read before the Theological Society.

Another and a far more ambitious project also originated about the same time with Dr. Pusey. This was "A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West, translated into English". Pusey, Keble, and Newman were to be the three joint-editors, and Pusey was delighted with the project, not only as being quite in his own line, but also as tending to unite the trio more closely together. "You know," he writes to Keble (1836), "a treble cord is not easily broken; last year you and Newman left me to write my tracts 'On Holy Baptism' by myself; so this year I have intertwined yours and Newman's names so fast that I hope they will not easily slip away."[1] Pusey brought out the first volume, *The Confessions of S. Augustine*, and wrote a preface, pointing out the advantages of patristic studies; but in course of time the giant's share of the task fell upon the saintly Charles Marriott.[2] The benefits of the great undertaking could not be better stated

[1] *Life*, i. 425. [2] For a full account of this good man see *supra*, p. 37.

than in the words of Dr. Pusey's biographer: "The *Library of the Fathers* was at once an encouraging and a steadying influence; it made thoughtful adherents of the movement feel that the Fathers were behind them, and with the Fathers that ancient, undivided Church whom the Fathers represented. But it also kept before their minds the fact that the Fathers were in several respects unlike the moderns, not only in the English Church, but in the Church of Rome. It reminded them of a type of life and thought which all good men in their best moments would have been glad to make their own."[1]

Another project of Dr. Pusey, closely connected with the Library of the Fathers (which could of course find work for many hands), but also having the wider object of encouraging theological study generally, was to support, first in his own house, and then in a house he hired for the purpose, some promising young B.A.s who were without the benefit of a fellowship, and give them work to do for him. Mr. J. B. Mozley, who was invested with a sort of headship over the establishment, calls it "a reading and collating establishment to help in editing the Fathers";[2] but this was clearly not the whole, nor indeed the main purpose of Pusey's benevolent scheme. Such men as J. B. Mozley and Mark Pattison ought not to have been left out in the cold by the electors to fellowships so long as they were: both obtained at last the object of their

[1] *Life*, i. 434. [2] *Letters*, p. 78.

ambition; but meanwhile they were chiefly supported by Pusey, and it is needless to say that any work done by them for him was good of its kind.

The movement gained Pusey and lost Hurrell Froude almost at the same time. When Pusey joined the party, Froude was practically a dying man, and on Feb. 28, 1836, to the infinite regret of his many friends, he died at his native Dartington. With Froude passed away the most daring and "go-ahead" spirit connected with the whole movement. Newman was enthusiastic, but Froude was far more so; Newman waged war against the complacency which was a characteristic of the old Church party, but Froude was still more exasperated against it; Newman was not over-cautious in his invectives against the fallacies and prejudices of the age, but Froude was ten times less so. With an intense earnestness and thoroughness of conviction, with a fiery energy which would ride over anything, with a courage which sometimes amounted to audacity, and with an irresistibly attractive personality, there is no saying what would have happened if his short life had been prolonged. But it is not a very profitable speculation to conjecture what might have been. Suffice it to say that in one respect the influence of Froude was likely to have had exactly the opposite effect to that of Pusey. The one seemed, of all men, the most calculated to trouble the waters, the other, to pour oil upon them; and the fact that Froude dropped out just when Pusey began

to make his influence felt seemed to promise that henceforth the movement would create less hostility. After events, however, proved that this was not to be the case; and the causes are not far to seek.

The death of Dr. Burton, on Jan. 19, 1836, created a vacancy in the Regius Professorship of Divinity, and Lord Melbourne nominated to the vacant post Dr. Renn Dixon Hampden. Dr. Hampden was an Oriel man, and had been a fellow in the days of Copleston, Arnold, and Whately. He had been brought into contact both with the Oriel Noetics and the Oriel Tractarians; he can scarcely be said to have identified himself with either, but he approached nearer the former than the latter. His university career had been a distinguished one, and in 1832 he was appointed Bampton Lecturer, when he took for his subject "The Scholastic Philosophy in its relation to Christian Theology". In the fifteenth century this would have been an attractive subject; but it was hardly so in the nineteenth, when men had forgotten all about scholasticism. So the Bamptons fell rather flat at the time, though there were some who thought they detected in them sentiments of a dangerous tendency. The lecturer uttered nothing against the *doctrines* of Christianity, but he ascribed much of the *phraseology* in which those doctrines were clothed in later times to the scholastic philosophy, and that philosophy he condemned *in toto*. Scholasticism, he thought, had created "an atmosphere of mist" between us and

primitive truth. The Bamptons were not published until 1834, in which year Hampden also published a pamphlet entitled *Observations on Religious Dissent*, in support of the government measure for admitting dissenters into the universities, and in the same year he was appointed Professor of Moral Philosophy. Those who had suspected the "Bamptons" were confirmed in their suspicions by the *Observations*, and Newman frankly told Hampden (whom of course he knew personally) that his pamphlet tended to make shipwreck of the Christian faith, and (what was a dire offence at Oxford) to disturb the peace of the university. The matter would probably have blown over; but when in 1836 Hampden was appointed by the crown to teach that very subject on which his soundness was regarded as doubtful, the old High Church, the new High Church, and the Low Church parties in Oxford banded together to oppose what all alike regarded as a disastrous appointment. Hampden himself, in a truly Christian spirit, offered to resign, but the prime-minister was firm; whereupon the Oxford Convocation, which, after a long resistance on the part of the heads of houses, was at last allowed to act, showed its disapproval in a most marked way. After a futile attempt, which was quashed by the *veto* of the proctors, it returned to the charge after the expiration of the proctors' year of office, and succeeded in passing by an immense majority (474 to 94), in May, 1836, resolutions that the new

professor should be deprived of two important privileges attached to his office, that of voting for the select preachers, and that of being a judge on any question of heresy which was brought before the university.

Though the opposition to Dr. Hampden's appointment was a general one, including all parties except the Liberals, who were then very few in numbers, the main brunt of the odium fell upon the Tractarians; and there was a sort of rough justice in this, for there is no doubt that they constituted the backbone of the opposition. The odium found its bitterest expression in an article published in the *Edinburgh Review* for April, 1836, under the ominous title of "The Oxford Malignants". It was written by Dr. Arnold, and illustrates how exceedingly unpopular the Oxford men were outside their own circle, for Dr. Arnold was a representative man. "Was there ever", he asks, "an accusation involving its unhappy promoters in such a dilemma of infamy?" [as that which accused Hampden's Bamptons of heterodoxy]. The "charges were known to have proceeded from authors whose censure was to be courted by every good Christian minister". They were "a few obscure fanatics". The attack "bears upon it the character, not of error, but of *moral wickedness*". "In such a proceeding we see nothing of Christian zeal, but much of the mingled fraud, and baseness, and cruelty of fanatical persecution. And for such persecution

the plea of conscience is not admissible; it can only be a conscience so blinded by wilful neglect of the highest truth, or so corrupted by the habitual indulgence of evil passions, that it rather aggravates than excuses the guilt of those whom it misleads."[1] It will be noticed that the article was written, and, indeed, published before the final meeting of Convocation.

But a far stronger reason for the outcry against the new school than the Hampden controversy was the raising of the Roman question, which from various circumstances came to the front at this period. On "The Feast of the Circumcision, 1836", Newman published the first of his tracts (No. 71) "against Romanism", beginning with the words, "The controversy with the Romanists has overtaken us like a summer's cloud". Perhaps it is difficult to read this tract without being biassed by what afterwards happened to the writer; but it certainly seems to me, especially in its earlier part, to be a singularly cold and faint-hearted defence of the English Church against Rome; it leaves the

[1] For a defence of the article, or rather an explanation of Arnold's attitude when he wrote it, see Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, pp. 350–354. Dean Stanley frankly owns that the article contains "the most startling and vehement, because the most personal, language which he ever allowed himself to use", and that "the offence caused by it, even amongst his friends, was very great". Dr. Arnold, in a "letter to an old pupil" (see *Life*, pp. 369–370), implies that Mr. Newman had made unfair extracts from Hampden's writings, and it is fair to add that some years later Bp. S. Wilberforce, having carefully read the *Bampton Lectures* and *Observations on Religious Dissent*, thought the same. Charles Marriott also in later years says that he had an uncomfortable feeling that they had not been quite fair to Hampden.

impression that the writer is profoundly dissatisfied with the state of his own church; that he feels the majority of the popular arguments against Rome to be fallacious, and that he is more impressed than he cares to own by the counter-arguments of Rome. One can well understand a really strong English Churchman like Hugh James Rose protesting somewhat indignantly against the very hesitating tone in which Newman writes. "You must", says Rose, "let me not *endure*, but *love*—and warmly and passionately love—my mother church." The whole letter, as quoted by Dean Burgon,[1] is well worth reading; and the reader should remember that the writer was at least the equal of Newman in learning, in earnestness, in judgment—in everything, in short, except brilliancy.

The Hampden controversy helped to press the Roman question on the attention of the movement party. The friends of Dr. Hampden met the charge of heresy by a counter-charge of Romanism, and raised against them—as it was never difficult to do—the "No Popery" cry; and the Evangelicals, who had joined them in a most unwonted alliance, urged upon them the necessity of clearing themselves from the charge of Popery. Again, the astute Dr. Wiseman, regarding the present as a favourable opportunity, on his return to England began to lecture in London, in 1836, on "the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church"; and it was thought

[1] See *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, i. 214–221.

that these lectures were a challenge. The glove had been thrown down, and it would be cowardice not to take it up. Nor were the Tractarians at all unwilling to do so. They felt that, apart from special circumstances and outside pressure, the relations between England and Rome needed readjustment. Pusey expresses this view clearly and strongly in a letter to Newman in 1836. "As far as I know, most of our old controversy with Rome was carried on upon wrong (Genevan) principles; it would be a good thing to have one on the whole subject on right principles; it would bring out these principles; people would see that Catholic principles can be maintained against Popish, and would receive them the rather because they are on their own side."[1]

The upshot of it all was that in 1837 Newman published his very remarkable work on *The Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*. He had been engaged in it for three years; it contained the substance of a correspondence with "a learned French priest", and of some of the noted lectures delivered by him in Adam de Brome's chapel in S. Mary's, Oxford. Its spirit is certainly, as he says,[2] not so gentle towards Rome as Tract 71 was, but it seems to me to show yet more clearly how little hold the English Church, as a definite system, had upon Newman's mind. In it he elaborates his famous

[1] *Life*, ii. 4.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 64.

theory of the *Via Media*;[1]—in fact it was afterwards republished in the volumes entitled *The Via Media*. But what *is* this *Via Media* but the religion of all English Churchmen who had adhered faithfully to the original intention of the English Reformation? The deflections from that original intention were many and frequent, but they *were* deflections; and those who formed the backbone of the Church of England, her great divines, did *not* deflect. For a well-chosen list of them,—which, however, might *then* have been multiplied ten-fold, and *now* a hundred-fold,—we have only to turn to Newman's own *Catenæ Patrum* (that is, post-reformation fathers), from Bilson and Hooker in the sixteenth century to Van-Mildert and Mant in the nineteenth. And yet Newman could write in his Introduction: "It may be said that Protestantism and Popery are real religions; no one can doubt about them; they have furnished the mould in which nations have been cast; but the *Via Media* has never existed except on paper, it has never been reduced to practice; it is known, not positively but negatively, in its differences from the rival creeds, not in its own properties; and can only be described as a third system, neither the one nor the other, partly both, cutting between them, and, as if with a cruel fastidiousness, trifling with them both, and boasting to be nearer antiquity than either. What is this but to fancy a road over

[1] He had already written two tracts (Nos. 38 and 41), entitled *The Via Media*, but these are slight and popular.

mountains and rivers, which has never been cut out? When we profess our *Via Media* as very truth of the Apostles, we seem to be mere antiquarians or pedants, amusing ourselves with illusions or learned subtilties, and unable to grapple with things as they are. . . . It cannot be denied there is force in these considerations",—and so forth.

Surely it is not surprising that Mr. J. B. Mozley (as learned and acute a man as Mr. Newman himself), after quoting these words, should add: "Mr. Newman seems to start with a deep, latent incredulousness as to her [the English Church's] very existence, a primary doubt as to whether she has anything at all in her, and is made of anything more than paper. He says, 'Here is an experiment to be tried; we have a church that we know nothing about, and it has to be unfolded and brought out; it is a mere experiment'."[1]

It is a remarkable instance of what the magic touch of genius can effect, that Mr. Newman's volume produced a far greater impression than W. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, which appeared in the following year (1838). The works were singularly characteristic of their respective authors. In the former there is genius, brilliancy, an unrivalled beauty of style, but a painful uncertainty and unsettlement, as of one who has not yet found a sure footing; in the other a little stiffness

[1] See *The Christian Remembrancer*, No. 51, January, 1846, art. vi., "The Recent Schism".

and formality, a style which never carries one away with it, but an absolute certainty of conviction, a sure footing from which one feels instinctively that it will be impossible to dislodge the writer. It is, as Dean Church remarks, "an honour to English theology and learning";[1] "a most learned, most careful composition—one which no Anglican could write but himself", as Newman generously owns; but probably for one who reads Palmer, a hundred will read Newman. However, Mr. Palmer's book was received with well-deserved applause by the Tractarians, and it conduced, perhaps, to bring the two sections of the movement nearer together than they had been since the commencement of the Tracts.

Two compositions, however, which belong to the year 1838, not only widened again the breach between the two sections, but also tended more than anything that had yet been written to bring the whole movement into disfavour. One was the appearance of Tract No. 80, "On Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge". The writer, Mr. Isaac Williams, seemed the last man in the world likely to cast a fire-brand. Sensitive and retiring almost to a fault, a lover of peace and quietness, a most loyal son of the Church of England, and a pupil of the Fairford school, he might have been expected to pour oil upon the troubled waters rather than to disturb them. But he was a man of a singularly

[1] *The Oxford Movement*, p. 187.

delicate mind; intellectually, no less than morally, he shrank from the blatancy and coarseness with which the highest truths were tossed about even by good Christians whose minds were of a less delicate texture than his own. Against this tendency he wrote his first tract on "Reserve". The term "Reserve" was, he tells us,[1] suggested to him by Newman; and it must be owned that the suggestion was not a happy one, hinting, as it did, that there was something kept in the background, which was, in fact, one of the chief offences with which the Tractarians were charged. "Some", he says, with characteristic *naïveté*, "were alarmed at the name more than anything else"; and we may well believe that it was so; for, turning to the tract (or rather volume, for it covers 82 pages) itself, we find that at least three-fourths of it is devoted to proving up to the hilt, with a perfect wealth of illustration, the fact that both in the Old Testament and the New there *was* a certain reserve in communicating religious knowledge. It is difficult to see how any intelligent reader of the Bible could deny the fact, and what reasonable reply he could make to Mr. Williams' superabundant proof of it. The sting of the tract (to the few who got beyond the title) must have lain in part iii., where the writer applies his principle to the popular system of the day; and, most of all, in his strictures on the indiscriminate and exclusive prominence which was given in it to

[1] *Autobiography*, p. 90.

the doctrine of the Atonement. Here, perhaps, the Evangelicals had reason to complain that justice was not done to the teaching of their best men; but it really is difficult to see why so violent an outcry should have been raised against the tract as a whole. Mr. Williams, however, had all the calm courage of his spiritual mentor, John Keble; and, instead of being silenced by the clamour, he at once set himself to work to produce another and much longer tract on the same subject, which appeared as No. 87, dated The Feast of the Purification, 1840. So far from retracting anything that he had written, he calmly declared at the commencement that "after diligent examination of all that has been said against his former tract, he is not aware of one single argument adduced that touches the question; but much vague declamation, and strong alarms expressed, because the view interferes with certain peculiar religious opinions, or on account of some motives attributed to the writer's friends, or on other similar grounds, which, in fact (even were they true), in no way affect him or this principle". Many events, however, happened before this later tract appeared.

One of the most startling of these events was the appearance, in 1838, of the first series of Froude's *Remains*, edited by Keble and Newman jointly. It is not surprising that this publication raised a violent outcry; it gave to the world the off-hand utterances of a young enthusiast, whose opinions would probably have toned down with age, but were

here expressed with all the recklessness of inexperience, and were only intended, in the first instance, to be read by sympathetic friends. His views on the English Reformation and Reformers were sufficiently startling: "The present church system is an incubus upon the country". "The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted." The English Reformers generally were "a set of men with whom he wished to have less and less to do". Jewell in particular was "an irreverent dissenter"; Latimer "a martyr something in the *Bulteel* line".[1] One can conceive the horror with which such sentiments would be read by men with whom "our happy establishment in church and state", "our glorious Reformation", and "our martyred Reformers", were almost articles of faith!

It has been thought that the editors miscalculated the effect which the book would produce; but the theory is not very complimentary to their judgment. Surely they must have known that the glamour of Froude's personality would not affect the general, still less, the hostile reader,—and his name was legion,—who would greedily seize upon any handle which could be turned, as Froude could so easily be, against the movement. Moreover, how does it agree with the fact that, when they found out their mistake they nevertheless published in the following

[1] H. B. Bulteel had been a Low-church clergyman in Oxford, but his license to preach had been revoked by the Bishop of Oxford, in 1831, and he severed his connection with the Church of England.

year (1839) a second series as *outré* as the first? And this they introduced with a preface pointing out how Froude's sagacity had anticipated all the improvements that had taken place, and representing him, not as a disturber of the people, but as a prophet indeed. This preface is said to have been chiefly the work of Keble; and it is highly characteristic of the man, though not of the popular conception of him; for Keble was always for the bold course. The other editor, Newman, writing to his friend, F. Rogers, in July, 1837, gives six reasons why Froude's private letters should be published; and to his co-editor he writes at the same time: "We have often said the movement must be *enthusiastic*. Now here is a man fitted above all others to kindle enthusiasm."[1] May it not have been that both editors put forth the *Remains* with their eyes perfectly wide-open as to what the result would be? That they were not unwilling that the *enfant terrible* of the movement should say his say and startle the public? The public *was* startled; it took in all seriousness the audacious dicta of Froude as if they were stamped with the approval of the whole party, which it denounced with increased vigour accordingly.

It is impossible to help connecting with the publication of Froude's *Remains* the starting of that project which gave to Oxford one of the most beautiful of its many beautiful monuments, the "Martyrs'

[1] *Letters, &c., of J. H. Newman*, ii. 237, and 240–1.

Memorial", opposite Balliol College, on the spot on which Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer had been burnt. The greatest offence of Froude was that he had spoken disparagingly of the English reformers generally, and of these men in particular. The project of the Memorial originated in a small meeting held towards the close of 1838 at Oriel in the rooms of Mr. Golightly, who, having begun as a friend of the movement, had soon become its bitterest and most persistent foe. Everybody seems to have connected the Memorial with the *Remains*, but there was some division of opinion as to the course which should be pursued. Keble and Newman were from the first opposed to the project, and so were moderate men like Palmer and Benjamin Harrison. But Hook and S. Wilberforce were in favour; and so, strange to say, was Pusey to a certain extent at first, until he was persuaded otherwise by Keble and Newman. "My final conclusion", he writes to Harrison, "about the Monument is that *I* had rather not have anything to do with it. Three years ago I printed (Baptism, part iii.), that the great mercy in our Reformation was that we had no human founder; we were not identified with men, or any set of men." Harrison had written to him a little earlier, "I heard the other day that it would seem in its first origination to have been called forth by the publication of Froude's *Remains*, and so designed as an antagonistic movement". Keble writes to Pusey, "I cannot under-

stand how poor Cranmer could be reckoned a *bonâ fide* martyr according to the rules of the Primitive Church. Was he not an unwilling sufferer?" And in the same letter he declares boldly, "I am not at all prepared to express a public dissent from Froude in his opinion of the Reformers as a party".[1] On the other hand, S. Wilberforce writes to Hook, regretting that "our good Oxford friends run down reformers, and will not subscribe to the 'Martyrs' Memorial'".[2]

It was said of the Memorial, "It will be a good cut against Newman";[3] but it was not a cut which made him smart. He was far more pained by another cut, a much gentler one, which he received in the earlier part of the same year, 1838. Of course it was of the very essence of a movement which originated above all things in the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, to have the sanction of the successors of the apostles—though in its early days it was singularly unsuccessful in obtaining that sanction. But Newman was more sensitive than the other two leaders about the approbation or disapprobation of individual bishops. His own diocesan, Bishop Bagot, had been, and still continued to be, a most kind, considerate, and judicious friend, and had, in fact, incurred much odium for dealing so gently with him. In the spring of 1838 Bishop Bagot delivered a charge to the clergy of

[1] See *Life of Dr. Pusey*, ii. 64, 67, and 71.
[2] *Life of Bishop S. Wilberforce*, i. 132.
[3] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 67.

the Oxford diocese, in which he expressed some slight disapproval of parts of the Tracts—so slight that the enemies of the movement were much dissatisfied. It was quite enough, however, for Newman. He writes at once to Keble—the one friend on whose advice he always acted in a crisis—"I am just come away from hearing the bishop's charge, and certainly I am disappointed in the part in which he spoke of us. He said he must allude to a remarkable development, both in matters of discipline and doctrine, in one part of the diocese; he had had many anonymous letters charging us with Romanism, &c. I *must* cease the tracts if the bishop says parts are dangerous." Keble agreed, and Newman wrote to Bowden, "The bishop has given us a slap. What he said was very slight indeed, but a bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedrâ*, is heavy. The whole effect was cold towards us. . . . I felt it impossible to continue the Tracts, and wrote to Keble about it. He, without knowing my opinion, quite took the same view, stating it very strongly."[1] Pusey took a different view, but when it was a question between Keble and Pusey, Newman always followed Keble; and he turned upon his friend Pusey with something of his old fierceness, "I do not think you enter into my situation, nor can anyone. I have for several years been working against all sorts of opposition, and with hardly a friendly voice. Consider how few persons have said a word in favour

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ii. 257 and 260.

of me. Do you think the thought never comes across me that I am putting myself out of my place? What warrant have I for putting myself so forward against the world? Am I a bishop or professor, or in any station which gives me a right to speak?"[1] So he wrote to the Archdeacon of Oxford, using the same words as he used to Bowden, and offered to submit the Tracts entirely to the bishop's disposal. He also wrote to the bishop himself, offering to withdraw any of the Tracts over which he had control, if he were informed which were those to which his lordship had objections, and declaring that he should feel a more lively pleasure in knowing that he was submitting to the bishop's expressed judgment, than he could have even in the widest circulation of the volumes in question. The bishop, however, did not desire that any measures should be taken, and the matter dropped.

In spite—partly, perhaps, in consequence—of the bitter hostility which it had evoked, the movement had spread most rapidly and widely, and its principles had sunk most deeply into the hearts of many churchmen by the close of 1838. Mr. Palmer expresses indignantly, but not unjustly, the character of a great part of the opposition against it. "Party feeling has led to every species of unfairness. Exaggeration of facts has almost universally prevailed; motives have been unjustly imputed; character has been traduced."[2] This kind of tactics is sure in the

[1] *Life of Dr. Pusey*, ii. 58. [2] *Narrative of Events, &c.*, p. 197.

long run to defeat its own end. Up to this time the friends of the movement had manifestly the Prayer-Book on their side, and the Fathers at their back. Churchmen, at any rate, though they might condemn Keble, Newman, and Pusey, would think twice before they condemned the early Fathers and the great English divines of the seventeenth century; and, if they could divest themselves of prejudice—a large "if"—must have seen on which side these indisputable authorities were. The "Catenæ Patrum" and the "Library of the Fathers" were overwhelmingly powerful allies of the movement. And hitherto, the differences between its friends had been mainly differences about the means by which the end was to be attained, not about the end itself. But now came a change in this vital point. In the year 1839 the movement enters upon a new and very alarming phase, which will form the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter IV.

Third Stage of the Movement (1839–1845).

The eventful year 1839 opened with bright prospects for the movement. The leaders had, as we have seen, wisely acted on the principle of making no direct reply to the attacks which had been made upon them from all quarters; they had simply en-

forced what they believed to be the truth, and left it to make its own way.

But the time had now arrived when they were forced to vindicate their conduct and their principles. They had professed the utmost readiness to comply with the wishes of the bishops, as successors of the Apostles; and when his diocesan, Bishop Bagot, requested Dr. Pusey to make some form of declaration which would clearly show his loyalty to the English Church, Pusey at once complied, and wrote his famous *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, in which he cleared Tractarianism, as it then was, from any leaning towards Rome, and vindicated the *Via Media* as the faith of the Primitive Church "after whose model our own was formed". This was a task which Pusey was far better qualified to perform than either Keble or Newman: he was not only the most learned of the three, but also the one who was most in touch with other schools of thought. The "Letter" was an admirable one, and was accepted by the Tractarians, as a body, as expressing their views. It was published on S. Matthias' Day (February 24) 1839—the date is important in the light of future events now to be recorded.

"In the spring of 1839", writes Newman,[1] "my position in the Anglican Church was at its height. I had supreme confidence in my controversial *status*, and I had a great and still growing success in recommending it to others." But in April, 1839, he

[1] *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, ch. iii. p. 93.

published in the *British Critic* his marvellously able article "On the State of Religious Parties"—"the last words which I ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans", "my parting address and valediction to my friends, though I little knew it at the time".[1]

What brought about the startling change?

It was not quite so startling as it seemed. In spite of his success in exercising unbounded influence over others, we have his own word for it that he was not, and never had been, quite settled himself. In tracing his mental history up to 1841, he writes: "And first, I will say, whatever comes of saying it, for I leave inferences to others, that for years I must have had something of an habitual notion, though it was latent, and had never led me to distrust my own convictions, that my mind had not found its ultimate rest, and that in some sense or other I was on a journey".[2] The stages of this journey he describes with painful vividness.

In June, 1839, he began to study the history of the Monophysites, and the conviction flashed upon him that his church of the *Via Media* was in the position of the Oriental communion, while Rome was where she now is. If the Monophysites were heretics, were not the Anglicans so too? In the autumn of 1839 he read an article in the August number of the *Dublin Review* on "The Anglican Claim" by Dr. Wiseman, in which a parallel was drawn between the Donatists and the Anglicans. It did not con-

[1] *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, ch. iii., p. 94. [2] *Id.*, p. 119.

vince him at the time, but a friend pointed out to him the words of S. Augustine, quoted in the *Review*, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum", a dictum which corresponded closely with a dictum of Aristotle, with which as an Oxford man he must have been familiar: "What all men say, that *we* say". The dictum applied to the Donatists; did it not also apply to the Anglicans? If it did, the argument from antiquity was gone, the theory of the *Via Media* was absolutely pulverized. Then, as will shortly appear, he wrote Tract 90, and the outcry which it raised showed him that he could not be allowed to hold the articles in a Catholic sense, and this alienated him still more from the Anglican Church. This was in the spring of 1841; in the summer of the same year he determined to put aside controversy, and devoted himself to his translation of S. Athanasius. But this, of course, drew his attention to the Arians, with whom S. Athanasius waged war, and he found the same phenomenon which had so startled him in the history of the Monophysites. The pure Arians, he thought, corresponded to the Protestants, the Semi-Arians to the Anglicans, and again Rome now was what it was then.

Contemporary as well as past history contributed to his unsettlement. The scheme of the Jerusalem Bishopric, for which, however, the church as a body can hardly be regarded as responsible, seemed to him a recognition of heresy, allowing, as it did,

heretics to put themselves under an Anglican bishop without any renunciation of their errors. He sent a solemn protest against the project to the Archbishop of Canterbury (November 11, 1841); but the project was carried out, and this was "the last blow that broke him". Henceforth it was merely a question of time when he would leave the church of his fathers.

In 1839 another actor comes upon the scene who was a very prominent figure in the movement for the next six years. "The only real news", writes Newman to his friend Bowden in May, 1839, "is the accession of Ward of Balliol to good principles. He is a very important accession."[1] But if by "good principles" are meant the principles of the early Tractarians, Mr. Ward was no accession at all, as Newman himself afterwards discovered. "Your father", he told Mr. Wilfrid Ward, the son and most interesting biographer of W. G. Ward, "was never a High Churchman." And Mr. Wilfrid Ward himself writes: "He had no distinctive affection for the Anglican Church. He disliked it in the present, and he knew nothing of its past. The study of primitive times was uncongenial to his unhistoric mind."[2] The chief religious influence which had affected him was that of Dr. Arnold, as interpreted by A. P. Stanley. But he was now attracted to the Tractarians, first by Froude's *Remains* (the chief attraction of which was probably

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ii. 282.

[2] *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 136 and 141.

Froude's dislike of the Reformers and dissatisfaction with the church as it was), and then by the irresistible fascination of Newman, to whom he attached himself, as so many did, with enthusiastic devotion. "My creed", he said to his friend, James Lonsdale, "is very short, *Credo in Newmannum*".[1]

With W. G. Ward is generally coupled his friend and brother-fellow of Balliol, Frederick Oakeley, an able man and elegant writer who had been trained in Evangelicalism. These two became the most prominent and influential members of the distinctively Romanizing section of the movement, which was gradually gaining strength, and was influencing Newman rather than being influenced by him.

It is no wonder that the loyal friends of the English Church viewed with dismay the advance of this section, which was putting the most effective of all weapons into their enemies' hands. No one was more alarmed at the Romeward tendency than Pusey; and though there was no semblance of a division personally between the two great leaders resident at Oxford, each became unconsciously a centre round which a section rallied. "A certain party in this place [Oxford]", wrote Mr. Ward to Mr. Golightly in 1841 (and he might have written it earlier), "might now be considered to be divided into disciples of Mr. Newman and disciples of Mr. Pusey,—the latter opposed, the former no longer

[1] *Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ*, ch. iii., p. 33.

opposed, to Rome."[1] But this requires modification. Just as Wilkes was not a Wilkite, so Newman was not a Newmanite. He wished to be quiet and think the momentous question out for himself; but his so-called disciples would not allow him; he was being pushed on by others, rather than pushing others on. Besides the decided Romanizers, there were others who joined the movement as a new thing, and looked down, as from an eminence, on cautious, old-fashioned churchmen. A wise and judicious letter of Dr. Pusey, written in 1839 to one of those gentlemen, will illustrate what is meant: "Allow me one word of advice to yourself, which is, Do not think that you have possession of any new thing. What you have which is true has been taught quietly and unostentatiously by many in all times before you; it is in the Catechism and Liturgy; it has only been brought out into open day, and seems new to those who had forgotten it."[2]

It was in order to steady down these reckless and ardent spirits that Isaac Williams started the project of putting forth a series of *Plain Sermons by Writers of the Tracts for the Times*. "I saw", he tells us, "among ourselves greater dangers than those from without, which I attempted to obviate by publishing the Plain Sermons."[3] He enlisted among his contributors John and Thomas Keble, Pusey,

[1] "Correspondence illustrative of the actual state of Oxford, 1842"—quoted in Pusey's *Life*, ii. 229.

[2] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 144.

[3] *Autobiography*, p. 96.

Copeland, and Newman himself; and perhaps there would be no one more ready to help in the work than Newman, for no one suffered from the danger more than he. Rash, impulsive persons called themselves his disciples, and embarrassed him by going farther than he was at all prepared to go himself; and he was not at all sorry to have the opportunity of checking these ardent spirits, which he did by contributing a whole volume to the series. The first series appeared in January, 1839, and other series followed. The effect of the publication was, in Mr. Williams' opinion, "at the time very quieting". But it did not permanently check the advance of a party which was not nearly so strong as it was thought to be, and thought itself to be, but was still strong enough and noisy enough to be very embarrassing. Newman began to be almost in despair about his position at Oxford, and consulted Keble, his never-failing resource, as to the advisability of his resigning S. Mary's, giving three reasons for such a course: (1) because he was not influencing his own proper parishioners; (2) because he *was* exercising an influence on undergraduates to which he was not called; (3) because of the tendency of his opinions to create Roman sympathies. "The third", he writes to his friend Rogers (November, 1840), with a touching humility which would seem almost ludicrous and unnatural to those who did not know the relationship which subsisted between Newman and Keble, "was the only ground

he thought much of, and he gave me full leave to resign if I could do it without creating scandal. At the same time he said he wished me to remain, and did not think it a reason *necessitating* resignation. Upon this I felt I ought to remain, because what I wanted to get from him was *leave* to do so."[1]

Thus matters went on through 1840, the movement still gaining ground rapidly on all sides, and embarrassed rather than checked in its progress by the un-English party within the fold. But in the early part of 1841 came "the beginning of the end" of the "*Oxford* Movement", properly so-called. The first symptom was the appearance of John Keble's famous Tract 89, "On the Mysticism Attributed to the Early Fathers of the Church". Like No. 80, the substance of it had been the subject of more than one paper read at meetings of the Theological Society in Pusey's house. Like No. 80 also, its title probably helped largely to cause the offence which it created; for to English ears in the first half of the nineteenth century "mysticism"[2]

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, ii. 314, &c.

[2] "Mysticism" is, like "Methodism", a term given by enemies, not by friends. The so-called "mystic writers" rarely describe themselves as such; and they are called by their admirers not "mystical", but "spiritual" writers. I do not think that Keble was ever, properly speaking, a mystic, nor were any of the leaders of the Anglican movement. It therefore hardly comes within the province of this work to dwell upon the subject. In my opinion, the best description of mysticism (to define it is impossible) is that its aim is *Omnia videre in Deo—Deum videre in omnibus.* Perhaps I may be allowed to refer the reader who desires to know my views on the matter to chapters x. xi. and xii. in *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic*, pp. 140–220, which at any rate give them fully enough.

was as ugly a word as "reserve", especially when used by a leader of a party which was charged with concealing what it really meant. Having first admitted that they were "reserving", or keeping back some of the whole counsel of God, they now frankly justified the "mystification" of their readers.

As a matter of fact, Keble did nothing of the kind; he explained and justified the (so-called) mystical interpretation (1) of Holy Scripture, (2) of Nature. "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made", was virtually the text of the later and more important part of his treatise—for a treatise it was, not a tract. It is, in fact, an amplification of, and comment on the hymn for Septuagesima Sunday in *The Christian Year*, against which no exception had ever been taken. But Dean Church calls it an "inopportune" tract;[1] and the epithet is singularly appropriate in its literal sense, for at that day it was not likely to be attractive to either friend or foe. The time was not ripe for such refined and subtle, though perfectly innocuous speculations. "It is", says Mr. Lock, most truly,[2] "a poet's protest against a prosaic age, pleading for the beauty and fulness of life." But a prosaic age does not like being protested against, and refused to listen to the pleading. The tract produced no immediate effect in the direction which

[1] *The Oxford Movement*, ch. xiii. p. 229.

[2] Lock's *John Keble*, p. 101.

its writer desired, and only succeeded in swelling the outcry, already sufficiently loud, against the party from which it emanated. Also, like his disciple, Isaac Williams, Keble did not hesitate to express pretty plainly his low opinion of the popular religion of the period; and the period did not relish such plain speaking. If Keble's object had been to please the popular taste (which it was not, and never was), he might have taken warning by the fate of another whom he much admired—William Law, who lost all his popularity when he became "a mystic writer". And once more, a time of bitter controversy was not a time in which mysticism could ever find favour. Again to quote Mr. Lock: "It would have been difficult for these views to win ready acceptance at any time, most of all in Oxford in the beginning of 1841. A nightingale might as soon have expected to be listened to on a field of battle."[1]

But the alarm caused by No. 89 paled into insignificance before that which arose on the appearance of its successor. Tract No. 90, "Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles", is dated "The Conversion of S. Paul, 1841", and was published on February 27. The writer was Newman, and there is no reason to doubt his perfect good faith when he declares that he wrote it for the purpose of keeping waverers within the fold of the English Church. His aim

[1] Lock's *John Keble*, ch. iv. p. 102.

was to show that the Articles, though "the product of an un-Catholic age", were "patient of a Catholic interpretation". He certainly did not advocate, as he has been charged with doing, their acceptance in a non-natural sense. He would take them in their plain, grammatical sense, but not necessarily in the sense of their writers, still less in the sense which the later decrees of the Council of Trent might suggest. "The main thesis", he says, "of my essay was this: The Articles do not oppose Catholic teaching; they but partially oppose Roman dogma; they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of Rome. And the problem was to draw the line as to what they allowed and what they condemned."[1] He works out his case with great ingenuity and not a little special pleading; but many of his positions which were at the time fiercely assailed—notably his historical view of the Articles as "Articles of Peace"—are now generally adopted by competent theologians. Like all his writings since 1837, the Tract leaves an uncomfortable impression that the writer was dissatisfied with his own position. Thus, it was not reassuring to be told to go on teaching, "if only with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies and inconsistent precedents and principles partially developed". But nothing like evasion or moral dishonesty can be fairly predicated of it. Some years before, he had maintained that a certain latitude must be given

[1] *Apologia*, p. 79.

to the interpretation of the formularies of the church; otherwise they would press at least as heavily upon Liberals and Evangelicals as upon High Churchmen. "Two can play at that", he would say, when the latter were accused of acting inconsistently with those formularies. But in this case he would not have admitted that he claimed *any* latitude. He maintained that his views were perfectly consistent with the plain, literal meaning of the Articles, though not with the popular gloss upon that meaning. Whether he was right or wrong is another question; all that is maintained is, that he was not shuffling or disingenuous. But the way in which he was treated would certainly imply that he *was*. Four senior tutors, Mr. Tait of Balliol, Mr. Churton of Brasenose, Mr. Wilson of S. John's, and Mr. Griffiths of Wadham (with Mr. Golightly in the background, probably, urging them on), wrote a "Letter" to the editor of the *Tracts for the Times*, asking for the name of the writer, and asserting that the Tract suggested and opened a way by which men might, at least in the case of Roman views, violate their solemn engagements to the University. Newman at once admitted that he himself was the writer, and began to prepare his defence, which took the form of a "Letter to Dr. Jelf". But meanwhile the Heads of Houses took the matter up on their own account; and appointed a committee which drew up a resolution that "modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract,

evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they are designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the statutes which require subscription to the Articles". This document was posted on the buttery-hatches of the various colleges, for the benefit of undergraduates.

It will be seen that both the four tutors and the Heads impute not only error, but palpable dishonesty to the writer of the Tract. But even this was not all. The mere dates of the rapid sequence of events show that matters were pushed on with indecent haste. The Tract was published on February 27, the "Letter of the Four Tutors" was sent on March 8, the Vice-chancellor laid the Tract before the Board of Heads on March 10, and the Resolution was passed on March 15, without waiting for Newman's defence, which actually appeared on the very next day, March 16!

Perhaps allowance must be made for the heated atmosphere of Oxford at the time. But outside the University not only did Newman's friends rally round him, but men who had strongly disapproved of some of his doings were drawn towards him by the Englishman's love of fairness. Dr. Hook, who had never identified himself with the movement, was "indignant at the Hebdomadal Board taking upon itself to exercise judicial powers which properly belonged to the University at large, and at the

offensive terms in which its sentence was expressed".[1] So was Mr. Palmer, who was perhaps still more actively opposed to Newman on many points. So was Mr. Perceval. The judicial mind of Sir J. T. Coleridge revolted against the unjudicial way in which it had all been done. John Keble, with characteristic chivalry, wrote at once declaring that the Tract had been submitted to him before publication, and had met with his warmest approval. Pusey also wrote in defence of his friend, though he by no means agreed, as Keble did, with Newman's views on the point; for in this as in other matters Newman and Keble were much in advance of Pusey. On the other hand, Ward was much in advance both of Newman and Keble; but he wrote two very moderate pamphlets in Newman's defence entitled, "A Few Words", and "A Few Words More".

Men, again, who had any real knowledge of history perceived at once that Newman had much to say on his side. This was the case with Palmer, and also with J. B. Mozley, who was now fast coming to the front, and who wrote in a private letter to his sister most pertinently: "A new tract has come out this last week which is beginning to make a sensation. It is on the Articles, and shows that they bear a highly Catholic meaning, and that many doctrines of which the Romanist are corruptions, may be held consistently with them. This

[1] See Stephens' *Life of Dean Hook* (7th ed. in 1 vol.), p. 317.

is no more than what we know as a matter of history, for the Articles were expressly worded to bring in Roman Catholics. But people are astonished and confused at the idea now, as if it was quite new."[1] But the most astonishing thing of all was that Dr. Routh, the venerable president of Magdalen, who held quite aloof from the movement, or, indeed, from any movement, emerged from his obscurity and protested very strongly, "of course in writing, for he never goes near them himself",[2] against the resolution of his brother Heads. His profound learning showed him at once that they were wrong. Some whom outsiders would hardly have suspected as likely to take an interest in such a matter, entered the lists; Mr. Monckton Milnes, the poet and society man, but one who took a keen interest in theology, published a pamphlet entitled "One Tract More", in defence of Newman, who gratefully acknowledged his kindness in the *Apologia*;[3] and on the other hand, Mr. Robert Lowe, of all men in the world, attacked the Tract on the ground of bad faith and immorality.

Great surprise has been expressed that Newman himself was quite unprepared for the storm which the Tract created. But may not this be accounted for by his knowledge of theology? Without having anything like the deep and wide reading of Routh and Pusey, he was a well-read man, and may well

[1] *Letters of J. B. Mozley*, p. 112.
[2] *Id*, p. 116.
[3] Note at the end of *Apologia*, ch. ii.

have supposed that a learned university would at least have recognized the intellectual strength of his position, however much it might disapprove of his views. He would, however, probably have taken little heed of what either the University or the outside world said; but an intimation came to him from one whose lightest word was law to him, his own diocesan, that the Tracts had better cease. Newman at once complied with Bishop Bagot's request, and No. 90 was the last of the Tracts. This was really all that was done. No. 90 was never withdrawn from circulation; it was never condemned by the University as a body; Newman himself was never precluded from any office, academical or clerical. "But", he says, "I saw clearly that my place in the movement was lost; public confidence was at an end; my occupation was gone. It was simply an impossibility that I could say anything henceforth to good effect, when I had been posted up by the marshal on the buttery-hatch of every college of my University, after the manner of discommoned pastry-cooks, and when in every part of the country and every class of society, through every organ and opportunity of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner-tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway-carriages, I was denounced as a traitor who had laid his train and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honoured Establishment."[1] He was troubled also by the fact

[1] *Apologia*, p. 89.

that some who called themselves his disciples *would* go ahead of their leader, or try to force his hand. And, worst of all, his own mind became more and more unsettled. He accordingly withdrew himself by degrees from public notice, and in February, 1842, retired to Littlemore, which was part of the parish of S. Mary's, retaining his living until September 18, 1843.

Meanwhile the enemies of the movement at Oxford, emboldened by their success, went on triumphantly in their crusade. In the autumn of 1841 John Keble resigned the Poetry Professorship which he had held for ten years. One man stood prominently forward as his natural successor. Isaac Williams had every qualification for the post but one. He had been a resident Fellow and Tutor of Trinity; he was of unblemished character, and the last man in the world to make enemies who would oppose him on personal grounds; he had won his spurs in the domain of poetry, having already published *The Cathedral*, *Thoughts in Past Years*, and *Hymns translated from the Parisian Breviary*; in fact, as a sacred poet he stood second only to Keble; and in those days, when Oxford was an exclusively religious university, the epithet "sacred" should have counted for something. Moreover, he had all the advantage of the warm support of the outgoing professor, who had a claim upon the electors, as having himself held the office with conspicuous success; "but he was a leper"—he was tainted

with the scrofula of what now began to be called "Puseyism". Worse still, he had been the intimate friend and coadjutor of Newman at S. Mary's. Worst of all, he had been the writer of the most obnoxious of all the Tracts except No. 90.

The candidate put forth against Mr. Williams was Mr. Garbett, of Brasenose, an accomplished man and a first-classman, but one who had never had the faintest connection with poetry, either as a poet or a critic. A contest was avoided by a comparison of votes, which showed that there would be 921 for Mr. Garbett and only 621 for Mr. Williams. This was the first public defeat of the movement in the place of its birth. It took place in January, 1842.

It was followed in the same year by another attack upon the party, which was temporarily successful. Mr. Macmullen, a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and a well-known Tractarian, had by the statutes of his college to take his B.D. degree in due course if he would retain his place among the Fellows. Before doing so he had to go through what were called "the exercises for the degree"—that is, he had to defend two theses, which were generally selected by the candidate himself and approved by the Regius Professor of Divinity. The professor was Dr. Hampden, who sent Mr. Macmullen two theses to defend which no conscientious Tractarian *could* defend. Mr. Macmullen (as we shall see presently) was the last man

tamely to submit to such an indignity. The Gordian knot was cut by the vice-chancellor, who on his own responsibility stopped the degree, which, however, after much litigation, Mr. Macmullen at last succeeded in obtaining. The incident had no ultimate importance, but it is significant as being one instance out of many of the dogged determination at all hazards to quash the movement.

But in 1843 its opponents flew at higher game. On May 24 Dr. Pusey preached a university sermon on "The Holy Eucharist as a Comfort to the Penitent". It will be best to give his own account of the reason why he chose the subject: "When people said that I had scared them about post-baptismal sin"—that is, in Nos. 67, 68, and 69 in *Tracts for the Times*—"I was led to preach a course of sermons on 'Comforts to the Penitent'. Of these the sermon on the Holy Eucharist was one. It was a singular case of mistaking what people's feelings would be. For I chose the Holy Eucharist as the subject at which they would be less likely to take offence than at Absolution. But we know what happened."[1]

What *did* happen was this. The Margaret Professor of Divinity, Dr. Faussett, a vehement anti-Tractarian, requested the vice-chancellor to take measures for putting in force the statute *De concionibus*. That statute provided that when a sermon was "delated" to the vice-chancellor for heresy, he

[1] See Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, ii. 307.

should demand a copy of it, summon six Doctors of Divinity as his assessors, and if the sermon should be found to contain heresy, condemn and punish the preacher. The vice-chancellor, Dr. Wynter, President of S. John's, accordingly demanded the sermon, and appointed as his assessors to sit with him in judgment upon it, Drs. Faussett, Hawkins, Symons, Jenkyns, Ogilvie, and Jelf. Of these the first was the very man who had delated the sermon; but Dr. Wynter justified the choice on the ground that the Regius Professor (Dr. Hampden) was disqualified by the disabling statute of 1836,[1] and the Margaret Professor acted in his place as a matter of course; the second was one who was at complete variance with his Oriel friends on the subject of the movement; the third was the leader of the small Evangelical party at Oxford; the fourth, as Master of Balliol, was being worried out of his life by that most eccentric of Tractarians, W. G. Ward, Fellow of Balliol; the fifth had not committed himself to any side; and the sixth was a rather timid High Churchman. Before such a tribunal the issue of the inquiry was of course a foregone conclusion. But the details of the transaction—what were the incriminated passages of the sermon—what were the sentiments if any of the seven divines assembled in conclave, are profound secrets to this day. The statute indeed did not *require* that there should be any publication of the charges, or any defence on the

[1] See *supra*, pp. 72, 73.

part of the accused, though it left it open to allow both. Dr. Pusey in vain requested the vice-chancellor to "choose that course allowed by the statute, which permits the accused to answer for himself".[1] Even the sentence of the vice-chancellor was never formally announced; but it came out that that sentence was that Dr. Pusey was "guilty of preaching certain things dissonant from, and contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England",[2] and that he was suspended from preaching within the University for two years.

The whole proceedings were more like those of a mediæval Wehmgericht than of an English court in the nineteenth century, though no doubt they were all according to the letter of the statute. We turn in vain to the sermon itself to discover what were the heretical passages. It might have been preached by any of the great Caroline divines; for there is nothing in it which had not been previously expressed by them, and which is not amply covered by the writings of the early Fathers. If it were not singularly unlike the general character of Pusey, one might have fancied that there was a cutting irony in his reply to the vice-chancellor's demand for the sermon: "I would have sent you the sermon, but I thought it might save trouble if I were to add some references in some places to mark that I was using the language of the Fathers, not my own".

[1] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 317.

[2] "Quædam doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ dissona et contraria."

But, being what he was, he probably meant just what he said, viz. that he really wished to save his judges trouble, and prevent them from falling into ludicrous errors. "I thought this best," he writes with characteristic simplicity to a friend, "that they might not be exposed unconsciously to condemn, *e.g.* S. Cyril of Alexandria, when they thought they were only condemning me."[1] There is an interesting letter of James Mozley—a cool observer—which shows how it appeared to a contemporary who probably heard it: "It was one of Pusey's sermons, and therefore of course contained high doctrinal views; the audience recognized that fact, went home, were perfectly at their ease, thought nothing more about it,—the reverential impression excepted, of course, which that preacher's discourses always leave upon the mind; when all on a sudden comes, like a clap of thunder on the ear, the news that the Board of Heresy is summoned to sit on Dr. Pusey".[2]

But the matter was not allowed to rest. First came an address to the vice-chancellor signed by sixty-one resident members of Convocation and B.C.L.'s, asking him to make known to the University the grounds on which sentence on Pusey was passed; and then one from non-residents, including such names as those of Mr. Gladstone and Sir J. T. Coleridge, which said more boldly, "We deprecate that construction of the statute under which

[1] *Life*, ii. 311 and 312. [2] Quoted in *Pusey's Life*, ii. 309.

Dr. Pusey has been condemned, which, contrary to the general principles of justice, subjects a person to penalties without affording him the means of explanation or defence". Coleridge's judicial mind was again outraged, as it had been in the case of No. 90, and he wrote to the vice-chancellor in 1844: "My conduct proceeded and proceeds on the most undoubting conviction that the course pursued was not only cruel to him and radically unjust in principle, but most dangerous to the church". I. Williams was particularly shocked; "Pusey", he says, "is the one of all others least inclined to secede to Rome".

As to Dr. Pusey himself, he accepted the sentence with that meekness which was one of his most distinguishing characteristics, quietly waiting until the expiry of the period of his suspension.

To understand how the next—and last—conflict between the Oxford writers and the Oxford authorities arose, we must go back a year or two. In 1841 Newman gave up the editorship of the *British Critic*, and his brother-in-law, Thomas Mozley, undertook it. The writers, freed from the restraining hand of Newman, began to run riot in distinctly Roman articles, chiefly the product of Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley. Palmer remonstrated on the subject with Newman, who, he says, "replied under evident excitement, and in a spirit which was new to me. He said that he was no longer editor of the *British Critic*; that it had passed under different

control; that the heads of the church had thought fit to condemn him and to destroy his usefulness; that they had silenced him, and that they would now have to deal with younger men, whom it was not in his power to restrain; that they would in future have to deal with a different class of men. He finally declared his resolution not to interfere."[1] Foiled in this direction, Palmer wrote a pamphlet on his own account, which gave, as the title expresses it, "A Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*, with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism, and on the present duties and prospects of the members of the church". No one had a better right to give such an account, for he had been a prime mover, though the movement took a direction of which he did not wholly approve. The object of the *Narrative* is to show that the later development, as represented by the *British Critic*, was totally contrary to the original intention; and the point aimed at is proved beyond possibility of doubt. The pamphlet was read and approved before it was printed by Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, to whom it is dedicated; but the bishop objected to the insertion of letters of censure on the Romanizing party, which the writer had received from "leading churchmen" to whom he had shown the manuscript, and

[1] *Narrative*, &c., p. 77. Pusey also remonstrated with Newman, and apparently with a little better effect, for he writes, Aug. 9, 1841, "It is a great relief to me that you mean to urge Oakeley and Ward to be quiet". See *Life of Pusey*, ii. 218 and 225.

which he had inserted in the Preface. The bishop thought, perhaps rightly, that to print them would only tend to drive waverers to Rome; but their omission is a loss, as the testimony given in them might have emphasized a point which ought never to be forgotten, viz. that the Roman party was only a small clique, while the main body of churchmen were absolutely loyal to the English Church.

Almost simultaneously with the publication of the *Narrative*, that is, in the autumn of 1843, the *British Critic* became defunct; so the writers could not defend themselves in their own organ. But it was understood that Mr. Ward was preparing an answer; and this answer appeared in the summer of 1844, not in the form of a pamphlet like Mr. Palmer's, but of a bulky volume of 600 pages, entitled, *The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in Comparison with Existing Parties*. Mr. Palmer had awaited with some nervousness the appearance of a work in which he expected at least some attempt, on the part of a very able man and acute logician, to defend himself against the charges of the *Narrative*; and it is amusing to observe with what mingled feelings of relief, amazement, and perhaps a little disappointment, he found that there was no attempt of the kind. He was an Irishman, and did not dislike the idea of a combat—especially a combat for which he felt himself armed at all points. But Mr. Ward admitted the truth of all the imputations. There was no combat at all. Mr.

Palmer had nothing more to do; *The Ideal of a Christian Church* was quite different from the English Church; the Roman approached far more nearly to it. Mr. Ward was regarded as a disciple of Mr. Newman; but *The Ideal* shows that the disciple far outstripped the master. Mr. Newman did not advocate subscription to the Articles in a non-natural sense; but Mr. Ward did. "Our 11th Article is as plain as words can make it on the Evangelical side; of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense" (p. 479). Mr. Newman had criticised very carefully and temperately the Lutheran doctrine of justification; but Mr. Ward "had the greatest satisfaction in reflecting that he had ventured to characterize that hateful and fearful type of Antichrist in terms not wholly inadequate to its prodigious demerits" (p. 305). And as to Mr. Palmer, he need not have troubled himself to prove elaborately that there was a Roman party in the church. It is admitted without proof. "We find, oh! most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight, we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen" (p. 565). As to the writer himself: "Three years", he says, "have passed since I said plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounced no Roman doctrine, yet I retain my fellowship, which I held on the tenure of subscription, and have received no ecclesiastical censure in any shape" (p. 567).

But it was scarcely likely that after such exceedingly frank avowals he would escape censure much longer; and it is not surprising that, as soon as the October term began, the Board of Heads appointed a committee to examine the book, and that in December they announced that they were going to submit to Convocation three measures. These measures were: (1) to condemn Mr. Ward's book; (2) to degrade Mr. Ward by depriving him of all his University degrees; and (3) whereas the existing statutes gave the vice-chancellor power of calling any member of the University at any time to prove his orthodoxy by subscribing the Articles, to add to this a declaration, to be henceforth made by the subscriber, that he took them in the sense in which they were both first published and were now imposed by the University, with the penalty of expulsion against any one, lay or clerical, who thrice refused subscription with this declaration.[1]

The last measure was abandoned in consequence of an outcry being raised against it as imposing a new test, but another measure was introduced in its place containing a formal censure of the No. 90 of four years ago!

On Feb. 13, 1845, in the roughest of weather, the Convocation met in the Sheldonian Theatre. There was no speaking except the address of Mr. Ward, who obtained leave to speak in English. His "defence" was merely a reiteration of the principles he

[1] Dean Church, *The Oxford Movement*, ch. xviii. p. 326–7.

had advocated in the *British Critic* and *The Ideal*. Mr. J. B. Mozley, who was present, declares that "he said twenty times in the course of his speech, 'I believe all the articles of the Roman Church'".[1] Then came the voting. The first measure, for condemning the book, was carried by 777 against 386; the second, for degrading the writer, by 569 against 511; but when it came to the third measure, for censuring No. 90, the proctors exercised their privilege of *veto*, and therefore no vote was taken.

Meanwhile the great leader himself, to whom so many eyes had been turned, was in retirement at Littlemore—his Torres Vedras—only desirous of being left alone that he might work out the vital question between himself and his God. But this was just what he was not allowed to do. For years he had been too conspicuous an object of reverence to friends, and of suspicion to foes, to be allowed to remain quiet. He was subjected to much impertinent curiosity of men who wished to find out what he was doing at Littlemore. "Doing there!" he writes indignantly; "have I not retreated from you? have I not given up my position and my place? am I alone, of Englishmen, not to have the privilege to go where I will, no questions asked?"[2] His position was completely misunderstood. He was supposed to have made up his mind, when he had really not done so. Nay, he was suspected of acting the part of a traitor to the Church whose ministry he had

[1] *Letters of J. B. Mozley*, p. 164. [2] *Apologia*, p. 172.

abandoned, though he still remained in lay communion, and of luring on others away from her. But instead of pushing on his friends Romewards, he was really being pushed on by them, driven into a corner, forced to answer questions which he would have much preferred not to have been asked. From the close of 1841 he had been on his deathbed as regarded his membership with the Anglican Church,[1] but the death-struggle was a very long and lingering process.

In the first place, though he was dissatisfied with England, he was by no means satisfied with Rome. Was she the true Church? If she had the note of Catholicity, which England had not, she had not the note of Antiquity, which England had. He was in a strait between two: he could not continue his ministry in the Church of England, if he was not allowed to hold the Thirty-nine Articles in a Catholic sense. He could not join the Church of Rome if, contrary to the practice of Antiquity, she paid to the creature the worship due solely to the Creator. Besides, there were personal ties which detained him where he was. What would be the effect of his desertion upon the disciples who hung upon his words? what upon the Oxford that he knew and loved so well? Might it not bring in that very Liberalism, the dread of which had been the first cause of the whole movement of which he had been the leader? And then

[1] *Apologia*, beginning of ch. iv.

there were closer ties still—those which bound him to his own family, and his own intimate friends, such as Keble, Pusey, and Marriott. He was very warm-hearted and had strong family affections; nothing can be more heart-rending than his letters addressed to members of his own family at this crisis of his life.

On the other hand, he felt that he had been cast off by his own Church; he had no longer any place in her; the Bishops, for whose office he had intense reverence, had charged against him; Oxford had virtually condemned him. Not that he was at all affected by the last futile attempt of the Heads to revive the odium of No. 90. On the contrary, he was rather disappointed that the decree did not pass. It would have simplified matters and smoothed the way towards that goal which everybody (except Pusey, who hoped against hope and turned a deaf ear to Newman himself) saw that he must reach sooner or later. Writing to Pusey when the excitement about Ward's *Ideal* was at its height, he says: "The matter now going on has not given me a moment's pain—nay, or interest".[1] His whole mind was engaged in ridding himself of the last intellectual obstacle—the others were sentimental, and would of course give way when the course was made plain—which prevented him from joining the Church of Rome; that is, in writing his *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*. It was not a new subject to him; he had already preached a famous

[1] *Pusey's Life*, ii. 429.

sermon in the University pulpit about it in 1843; and now he employed the whole of 1845 up to the fatal October in elaborating the theory which, if sound, would dispose of the difficulty about antiquity. "Before I got to the end", he writes (*Apologia*, p. 366), "I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished"; and he adds a postscript to the "Advertisement" of the work: "Since the above was written the author has joined the Catholic Church". The date of the "Advertisement" is October 6, and on October 10 he was received into the Roman Church by Father Dominic, the Passionist.[1] Some had preceded him, many followed him, but the other two members of the great trio were absolutely unmoved. It was personally a terrible shock both to Keble and Pusey, especially to Keble; for, curiously enough, Pusey, who had been most sanguine about retaining him, bore the parting best when it actually came. The three friends met once again at a later day; but they were virtually parted for ever in this world, and the beautiful lines of one who had prepared the way for their work in the English Church, are applicable to them in the spirit, if not in the letter:—

> "They parted—ne'er to meet again!
> But never either found another

[1] See R. H. Hutton's *Cardinal Newman* (Eng. Rel. Leaders' Series), p. 186. Newman (*Apologia*, closing part of ch. iv.) tells us that he wrote on *October 8* to his friends that he was expecting Father Dominic *that night*, but Mr. Hutton gives good reason for thinking that *October 10* was the actual day of his reception.

To free the hollow heart from paining;
They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
Like cliffs which had been rent asunder".[1]

The year 1845 saw the collapse of "the Oxford Movement" in one sense; that is, Oxford was no longer the centre from which everything issued and to which everything turned. But in another sense, the movement, so far from having suffered collapse, was spreading and strengthening itself in all directions. So it is not the melancholy history of a "Decline and Fall", but the joyous history of a continuous advance which will form the subject of the ensuing chapters. In fact, the secession of a number of men who had been manifestly tending towards Rome for some time, was really a relief and cause of strength to those who still remained loyal to the English Church. It was the bursting of the storm which cleared the air, and left a freer scope for the development of those principles which were clogged and hampered by the nominal adherence of those who never heartily accepted them. The true Church of England was not a thing to be apologized for, and made the best of, but a thing to be gloried in, and to be thankful for; and it was soon found that all except a small minority, who had been more Roman than English from the first, accepted it as such.

[1] Coleridge's *Christabel.*

Chapter V.

Oxford after Newman's Secession.

After the secession of Newman there could be no doubt who was to be the leader of the movement. Indeed that matter had been settled long before by the popular voice. The party had been called "Puseyites", not "Newmanites", for some years. The title may have partly arisen from the fact that in the early stage Pusey had been the only one who had given the clue to his identity by attaching his initials to his Tract on Fasting, and signing with his full name a letter prefixed to a later Tract. But there is a sense in which he had been the real chief even before Newman's secession. It was he who not only gave the new shape to the Tracts, and revivified them when they were *in extremis* in 1835, but who was also the chief agent in making the whole work of the movement more solid, substantial, and learned. After the catastrophe there could be no question about the matter. Mr. Palmer speaks of him as "the self-constituted leader of the Tractarian party",[1] and so in a way he was. That is to say, he at once took the reins into his own hands, and publicly announced himself as leader of the scattered and bewildered forces. But those little understood the true character of Dr. Pusey, who regarded him on that account as a Diotrephes, "who loved to have

[1] *Narrative*, &c., p. 240.

the pre-eminence". It really was no time for hesitation or delay. As on the field of battle, when a leader falls, the next in command must at once take his place, so it was in this spiritual battle-field. And who could possibly take the place of the lost leader except Pusey?

The only other name that could in any way come into competition with his was that of John Keble. And there were several reasons why Keble could not occupy the vacant post. In the first place, he was wedded to his distant Hursley, which he had no intention of leaving; and a working leader of a great party, who buried himself in a remote country village, was an impossibility. Again, it is essential for such a leader to be absolutely confident of his position;—this Pusey *was*, but Keble for a time was *not*. He had been far more shaken by Newman's secession than Pusey had been; he never thought of following Newman's example, but he *did* think, for a time, that it might be necessary for him to adopt some such attitude as that of the Nonjurors, who remained the staunchest of staunch Churchmen, though they could not accept the Revolution settlement, and with whom he always had a strong and hereditary sympathy. The thought was merely a passing one, but while it lasted it naturally disqualified its holder for the post of leader. Once more, the time required emphatically, not so much a fighter, as a leader who would bring out the healing, conciliatory side of the movement, who had large views,

and who could thoroughly appreciate all that was good in other parties. These qualifications Pusey possessed in a far greater degree than his friend, who, in spite of his personal humility, was very combative, and who, when he had once made up his mind, could never go one inch-breadth out of his rut. Thomas Mozley, after doing full justice to his many admirable qualities, tells us "that Keble very soon lost his temper in discussion", and that "there really was no getting on with Keble without entire agreement, that is, submission".[1] This was when he was a very young man, flushed with University success immediately following a home training, and without the discipline of "give and take" which is one of the best features of a public school. Years softened down this characteristic, and grace kept it in check; but it was still there, and the career of a country clergyman was not the sort of career to remove it.

Pusey, perhaps, erred in the other extreme; he was too apt to yield, when a leader ought to have been firm; he was too ready to take everyone at his own estimate of himself, and was deficient in insight of character. These defects often brought him into trouble, especially in connection with men who, though they still remained in the English Church, were not loyal English Churchmen. But, on the whole, his policy of conciliation was a beneficial one. "I should myself", writes Mr. Palmer, "have often

[1] *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College*, i. 220 and 221.

been in favour of a sterner and more direct policy towards all who shared in semi-Romanizing and Ritualistic opinions, and whom Pusey conciliated; but my own opinions were proved to be faulty by the result; for by mild methods the church has been saved from further disruption, and retains all the energies which a different mode of proceeding might have lost."[1] Lord Selborne, after doing full justice to Pusey's "admirable personal qualities, his piety, charity, self-denial, consistency," adds: "I do not think that, when he led, he was a strong leader; he abetted and justified things which his natural moderation, good sense, if he had possessed Keble's firmness when his friends were concerned, might have been expected to disapprove, and for which his distaste, on occasions, was not concealed. He was a faithful member of the Church of England to the end, without any sign at any time of inclination towards Rome, though he desired peace between all churches, and with all men."[2] This last sentence is most literally true; but Pusey's guileless trustfulness sometimes made him think others as loyal to the church as himself, when they were nothing of the kind; and hence he was, not unnaturally, regarded at times as too favourable towards Rome. Another apparent drawback to Pusey's leadership was that he had been a recluse since the death of Mrs. Pusey, in 1839; he was never seen in general

[1] *Narrative* (Supplement), p. 241.
[2] *Memorials of Roundell, Earl of Selborne*, i. 399.

society, and was grave and silent even among friends. But this cut two ways. A religious leader must not make himself too common, or descend too readily from his pedestal. "I never", writes Newman, "had the staidness or dignity necessary for a leader."[1] Newman's irresistible charm of manner and character carried this off in his own case; but as a general principle, he is right in thinking that staidness and dignity are necessary for a leader of men. There was a great contrast between the two men in this respect, which was very marked when they were seen together. "Pusey's presence", writes Mr. Williams, "always checked Newman's lighter and unrestrained mood; and I was myself silenced by so awful a person."[2]

Be all this, however, as it may, Pusey was the recognized leader of the movement for many years. "He regulated the affairs of the remains of the Tract party, which were very powerful and numerous from 1845 to 1882."[3]

But there had always been a Triumvirate. Who was to make the third, now that Newman was gone?

A paper was privately circulated by the leaders among their followers, suggesting subjects for mutual intercession, such as, the unity and peace of the church, the conversion of sinners, the advancement and perseverance of the faithful. This paper

[1] *Apologia*, p. 59. [2] *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, p. 70.
[3] Palmer, Supplement to *Narrative*, p. 242.

was subscribed with the initials, "J. K., E. B. P., and C. M." "C. M." stands for Charles Marriott, and the subscription intimates that the two remaining leaders had tacitly "co-opted" him into their body. It is noticeable that "J. K." stands before "E. B. P.", and this was the right order, not only in point of seniority, but also as indicative of their future course. The party was to be led by Pusey, but Pusey himself was greatly under the influence of Keble, whom he accepted, not only as his spiritual father, but as one to whom he might have recourse in all emergencies. But who was this third member of the Triumvirate?

Charles Marriott (1811–1858) would have seemed to the superficial observer the last person in the world fitted to take Newman's place; for, to all appearance, he was the exact antipodes of the lost leader. Among the advantages which Newman possessed were an extraordinarily fascinating personality, a most persuasive eloquence, and a power of writing English which has rarely if ever been equalled. In all these points Marriott seemed to be conspicuously deficient. He was silent, absent-minded, nervous, and full of personal eccentricities which could hardly fail to provoke a smile. He was very far indeed from being a popular preacher, and he wrote in a plain, homely (though, of course, scholarly) style, which was not at all likely to be impressive. Newman was essentially a brilliant man in every way, Marriott essentially the reverse.

But all these drawbacks were merely on the surface; when we penetrate a little deeper, we see at once why Marriott was emphatically the right man in the right place, as third member of the triumvirate. It is to the great credit of the undergraduates that, next to Newman, no man had had, for a long time, so much influence over the more thoughtful and earnest of them as Charles Marriott, in spite of his manifold and manifest disadvantages. But it is not surprising. There is nothing that appeals more to the young mind than genuineness, and Charles Marriott was thoroughly genuine—genuine in his learning and scholarship, genuine in his saintliness, genuine in his heart-felt sympathy with the shy and the dull, as well as with the forward and the brilliant, genuine in his unswerving attachment to the church of his baptism. He was an ardent admirer and devoted disciple of Newman; and Newman on his part fully appreciated his disciple's merits. As early as 1840 he wrote to Pusey: "If one could do as one would, I would have Marriott provost [of Oriel]; he has a particular art of taking young men, and has had it from an undergraduate".[1] And again, in 1841, to Dr. Routh, in writing to whom he would naturally measure his words: "Marriott is a grave, sober, and deeply-religious person; a great reader of ecclesiastical antiquity; and has more influence with younger men than any one perhaps of his standing".[2] This is strong testimony from one who

[1] See *Life of Pusey*, ii. 138. [2] See Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, i. 345.

had himself to perfection the art of attracting young men; and it is thoroughly borne out by Dean Church, who was one of the young men attracted: "The only out-college man", he writes, "of any mark, except Moberly, that I knew much of while I was at Wadham [as an undergraduate], was Charles Marriott. . . . No man, I suppose, was more smiled at in Oxford, both for his words and his silence. But no man that I ever heard of, had such strange influence, the influence arising from sheer respect, in turbulent Oxford scenes among the undergraduates, as in the rows at the Union. No one was so listened to, as if men believed in his sincerity and truth of purpose, and entire absence of indirect motives."[1] It was an advantage to Marriott that he belonged to the right college. Oriel and Trinity had produced the chief originators, and been the chief centres of the movement, and it was meet that the new leader should be a Fellow of Oriel. On Newman's defection Marriott at once loyally transferred his allegiance to Pusey, though no one could be to him quite what Newman had been.

Another Oxford resident, who now begins to take a very prominent part in the movement, was Mr. J. B. Mozley, one of a very clever family. *James Bowling Mozley* (1813–1878) was one of those who had fallen deeply under the influence of Newman; but he never dreamed of following him to Rome. It

[1] See Dean Church's *Life and Letters*, pt. i. p. 13.

will be remembered that he was one of those graduate students of theology who were supported by Pusey before they won their fellowships; and he helped in editing "The Library of the Fathers". But his was one of those minds that develop late; and it was not until this later stage of the movement that he really came to the front, when for many years he did yeoman service to it by his pen.[1] He was a very independent thinker, who had not the slightest scruple about differing from his party, when he thought that party wrong. A memorable instance of this will appear on a later page. The times particularly needed a man of Mr. J. B. Mozley's peculiar abilities. We have seen how *The British Critic* collapsed in the autumn of 1843. It was succeeded in 1844 by *The Christian Remembrancer*, which had been founded in 1841, and had been well conducted for the three years under the joint-editorship of William Scott of Hoxton and Francis Garden. In 1844 it became a Quarterly, and Mr. J. B. Mozley for

[1] His character and position are summed up with great discrimination by his old Oriel friend, Lord Blachford (Sir Frederick Rogers): "He was wholly genuine—in his friendships, his arguments, his measurement of things, and in his devotion to the Church of England—not an imagination of his own mind, nor exactly the church as it is; but a distinct historical community, having, like his country, its defects and its merits; and in spite of these defects, capable of greatness and goodness on the basis supplied by its formularies and great divines. . . . With a lively discrimination of characters and situations, he had not the flexibility of address, the resource, the practical energy, or the taste for active movement, which are required for a leader. His line was thought, and in choosing theology for the object of that thought, he approached it on its philosophical side."—Review of Mozley's *Essays* in *The Nineteenth Century*, 1879.

a short time took the place of Mr. Garden; but during the greater part of its career, which ended in 1868, Mr. Scott, who was a very active and prominent member of the High Church party until his death in 1872, was its sole editor. But its success was greatly due to the good writing of Mr. J. B. Mozley. Its first number contained his brilliant article on Dr. Arnold,—though an old Rugbeian must venture to protest against the one-sidedness of the sketch which he drew. Many of his other essays, which have now become classical, first appeared in the pages of *The Christian Remembrancer*.

Mr. Mozley also helped largely in starting and writing up a longer-lived and still more effective periodical, *The Guardian*, which was planned by a few friends in 1844–5, and launched into the world on January 21, 1846. It sounds strange now to hear that *The Guardian* at first seemed likely to prove a failure,—in fact, that it narrowly escaped death half a year after its birth. "The fate of *The Guardian*", writes Mozley to his very clever sister Anne, in July, 1846, "is, I fear, sealed. The circulation keeps obstinately stationary."[1] The remonstrances of Christopher Wordsworth (afterwards Bishop of Lincoln) and others saved its life for a time. "*The Guardian*," writes Mozley again, "it has been resolved, is to go on to complete its year of trial, but not till after much consultation and doubt."[2] Happily the crisis was tided over, and

[1] *Letters*, &c., p. 178. [2] *Letters*, &c., p. 179.

The Guardian remains to this day not only an organ of which the party that it represents may well be proud, but a paper of wide and general interest.

With *The Christian Remembrancer* for a Quarterly and *The Guardian* for a Weekly, the High Church party was far more strongly represented in the press than it had ever been in the days of the Tracts. And it should be particularly noted that, so far as can be now ascertained, the chief writers in both—certainly in *The Guardian*—were Oxford men, and for the most part Oxford residents. This hardly tallies with the theory that after the catastrophe of 1845, Oxford talent deserted the Oxford movement. Mozley stands first of all; and Dean Church does not go one whit beyond the truth when he reckons him as, "after Mr. Newman, the most forcible and impressive of the Oxford writers".[1]

But there were other Oxford men, resident or non-resident, who seem to me decidedly superior as brilliant[2] writers to those of the earlier stage of the movement—always, of course, excepting Newman, who shines forth "*velut inter ignes Luna minores*".

Take, for instance, the two brothers Haddan. *Thomas Henry Haddan* (1814–1873) may be regarded, so far as that honour can be attributed to

[1] *The Oxford Movement*, p. 293.

[2] I would lay stress upon the epithet "brilliant", because I would not contend that any of them were superior in point of sound learning to the earlier writers in the movement.

any one man, as the originator of *The Guardian*. He was a double first-classman, a Fellow of Exeter, and afterwards Vinerian Fellow. Like others to be noticed in the same connection, he was a lawyer, not a clergyman, and, so far as theology was concerned, he did no work comparable to that of his younger brother *Arthur West Haddan* (1816–1873), another Oxford man, who became a resident Fellow of Trinity, where he was deeply influenced by Isaac Williams. For about a year he was Newman's assistant-curate at S. Mary's, and then succeeded Williams as college tutor of Trinity in 1842, remaining in that post until 1857. He wrote both for *The Christian Remembrancer* and *The Guardian* from the first; and his contributions, like those of Mr. Mozley, were peculiarly valuable to the cause, because the *forte* of both was ecclesiastical history; and on historical grounds the Anglican position was impregnable. Both could write not only forcibly but fiercely; and people soon learnt to be rather shy about attacking such authorities.

Another founder of *The Guardian* was a layman and a lawyer, *Mountague Bernard* (1820–1882), an Oxford first-classman and a Vinerian Fellow, and afterwards Fellow of All Souls, who soon undertook its higher editorial work, though Mr. Martin Sharp was ostensible editor as well as the publisher and admirable manager of its affairs; and there was yet another lawyer, *Frederick Rogers* (1811–1889), a double first-classman and Fellow of

Oriel, who was not only one of the founders of *The Guardian*, but has kindly left us a most interesting account of the first meetings of the projectors "in a room opposite the printing-press in Little Pulteney Street", where, in spite of the discouragement of the public, they went on "writing articles and revising proofs". And least of all must we forget to notice among the earliest writers both for *The Christian Remembrancer* and *The Guardian*, *R. W. Church* (1815–1890), another first-classman and Fellow of Oriel, the very flower of Oxford culture, who nearly fifty years later immortalized *The Oxford Movement* in a work which posterity will not easily let die. Both Rogers and Church were intimate friends of Newman, but neither of them was tempted for a moment to follow him to Rome.

With men such as these for its enthusiastic supporters, it was not in the least likely that the movement should die away in the place of its birth, simply because one Oxonian of real genius, and a few others of more or less brilliancy, deserted it. No! Even in Oxford, though it ceased to predominate, it never died. A great change undoubtedly came over the University after Newman's secession. Pusey himself had less to do with the movement at Oxford, and more to do with it in the country at large. Keble withdrew himself more and more from any connection with his old University. Isaac Williams, whose feelings were deeply hurt, as well

they might be, by the Poetry Professorship proceedings, retired into the country for good. The able men who have been noticed above affected the movement mainly by their pens, which would of course touch the outside world quite as much as Oxford itself. Our interest, therefore, will be no more centred at Oxford, but will take a wider range.

It will also be of a different character. Mr. Palmer characterizes the movement up to 1845 as "essentially an aristocratic movement, addressing itself to the higher and more educated classes through the medium of the intellect".[1] Perhaps "academical" would have been a happier epithet than "aristocratic", which conveys the idea of "the upper ten"; whereas, as a matter of fact, none of the leaders except Pusey, and few, if any, of the followers belonged to that select circle. But they *did* all belong to the aristocracy of intellect. The very *crême de la crême* of Oxford culture had been their ordinary food, and it affected them for life. They could not play to the gallery; they recoiled from anything that was merely showy and superficial; in the Keble group this delicacy was intensified by what has been called "the Fairford" or "the Bisley" influence; but it was conspicuous enough in them all. They had all the advantages, and also the disadvantages of being thoroughly imbued with the habit of mind, or to use their own expression, the ἦθος, which Oxford at its best would natur-

[1] *Narrative*, p. 60.

ally tend to foster—delicacy of touch, fastidiousness of criticism, and a want of acquaintance with the rough Philistinism of the outer world. And when we turn from the movement at Oxford to the same movement in that outer world, we feel at once that we are breathing a different air. The men with whom we are brought into contact, even the ablest and best of them, are of a different intellectual calibre. They are more practical, more effective perhaps, but far less delicately moulded, far less interesting as writers and thinkers. But before we pass on to this new phase, we must remember that there was another great university besides Oxford; and a short chapter, at any rate, may be devoted to Cambridge.

Chapter VI.

Cambridge and the Movement.

Cambridge was not, like Oxford, almost a virgin soil for the reception of definite church principles when the movement began. The ground had already been occupied by teachers who had produced a very deep religious impression among a certain class of piously-disposed young men. There were few if any men at Oxford of the type of Charles Simeon, William Farish, Isaac Milner, James Scholefield, Joseph and William Jowett. These, indeed, all belonged to an earlier generation,

but they had infused a strong Evangelical element into the University, which did not die out when they died. What was more or less true of the state of religion throughout the country was especially true of Cambridge; when a man was said to be "serious" it meant that he was an Evangelical. Even as late as 1846, when F. J. A. Hort went up as an undergraduate to Trinity, "It was natural", his biographer tells us, "that he should seek out first the teachers of the Evangelical school, who then represented what was best in the religious life of the University. Chief of these was Dr. Carus, for whom he always retained a great regard."[1]

And yet, if anywhere, one might have expected him to find at Trinity religion of a different type, for the High Church party had had some strong representatives there. Christopher Wordsworth the elder was Master from 1820, and held the office for more than twenty years. He was brother of William Wordsworth, with whom he was always on terms of the closest intimacy, and whose religious views he largely influenced. He had been an intimate friend of Joshua Watson, H. H. Norris, and the rest of the Clapton sect, and was an earnest and uncompromising High Churchman. R. W. Evans, author of *The Rectory of Valehead* and *The Bishopric of Souls*, had been Fellow and Tutor of the college for several years from 1814; and though he had now taken a living, he must, one would have thought,

[1] *Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, i. 41.

have left a High Church impress behind him. W. H. Mill, the famous Orientalist and quondam Fellow of Trinity, had returned to Cambridge as Christian Advocate, and in 1848 became Regius Professor of Hebrew; and he was always counted as a member of the same party. Christopher Wordsworth the younger had been classical lecturer at Trinity not so many years before, and was even then delivering his famous Hulsean lectures at Cambridge. Charles Webb Le Bas, who was a voluminous contributor to the *British Critic* both before and after Newman was editor, and also to the *British Magazine*, and was, moreover, famous as a university preacher, had been a Fellow of Trinity. And yet an earnest undergraduate had to turn to the Evangelicals as guides in his religious life. The fact is an illustration of what has been frequently intimated in these pages, viz. that though there was a compact and able party of excellent High Churchmen, quite apart from those who belonged to the Oxford movement of 1833, yet they had not at all succeeded in making their influence generally felt; and this, so far as Cambridge is concerned, is illustrated in a somewhat different way by the fact that when Hugh James Rose was beating about for writers for the *British Magazine* in 1831, he was obliged to have recourse to Oxford, because his own university furnished few who were available for the purpose.

Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to suppose that Cambridge contributed little or nothing

towards the general church movement. On the contrary, it did, in one sense, more than Oxford; or, at any rate, it came to the rescue when Oxford seemed (though only seemed) to have collapsed. The lectures of the Lady Margaret professor, J. J. Blunt, between 1840 and 1845, on the early Fathers, led men, as another Cambridge professor, Bishop Kaye, had done before, to the historical view, which has always been the strong side of the Anglican party; and his subsequent lectures on the "Acquirements and Principal Obligations and Duties of the Parish Priest" were an excellent guide to the working of a parish on High Church lines.

Christopher Wordsworth the younger, again, though he certainly cannot be called a Tractarian, was as certainly a very important factor in the Anglican movement. And the splendid reputation which he had won in his Cambridge career no doubt tended to commend his church principles in his own university; but he had really not very much to do with Cambridge in after-life. It was at Westminster, and afterwards in the diocese of Lincoln, that his main influence was exercised. As to his own personal views, Pusey, Keble, and Newman do not appear to have affected him at all, in the way either of attraction or of repulsion. He simply thought and read out the subject for himself; and the result he arrived at is expressed in a condensed form in his *Theophilus Anglicanus*, which has been, perhaps, the most widely influential

of all his many compositions. It appeared in 1843, just when the alarm excited by the obviously Roman tendency of a section of the Oxford party was reaching its height, and it met a deeply-felt want. No one could suspect Dr. Wordsworth of any leaning towards Rome; and he was so notably honest, guileless, and outspoken that no one could dream of thinking that he had any other object than that which appeared on the surface. His little manual gave the young churchman (it was originally intended simply for the writer's pupils at Harrow) a clear and definite conception, first of the Catholic Church; then of the Anglican branch of that Church, and her true position in relation to Rome on the one side and the various Protestant sects on the other; and then of her connection with the state as the national church of England. It is perfectly packed with information, fortified by well-chosen quotations from recognized divines, all tending to the support of English Church principles. But no one can read it without perceiving that it is absolutely independent of the Oxford movement; and no one can study the life and character of the writer without perceiving that they are of a totally different type from that of any of the Oxford leaders who have been described in these pages.

But there were some Cambridge men who approached much more nearly to the Oxford type than any who have been yet mentioned. Among these were the founders of the Cambridge Camden Society,

which was one of the first attempts, though not quite the first, to bring the ritual and doctrinal aspects of the church movement into harmony. This subject, however, will be treated of in a future chapter. Suffice it here to say that in 1839 a few very young men banded together chiefly with the view of improving church fabrics and church services, which (with, of course, notable exceptions) had fallen to a lamentably low ebb. One of the most vigorous and accomplished of these was *John Mason Neale* (1818—1866), who was, perhaps, the most pronounced "Puseyite" of all the Cantabs. Like Keble, Newman, and Marriott, he never attained to any dignity whatever in the English Church; but, like them, he deservedly won a reputation and exercised an influence far greater than most of the dignitaries of his time ever achieved. Poet, scholar, divine, historian, translator, tract-writer, tale-writer, ecclesiologist, journalist, Neale poured forth his varied works in rapid succession, and caught the ear of many different sections of society; while as warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead—a high-sounding title, which, however, only means that he was head of what Dr. Littledale frankly calls "an obscure alms-house",[1] with a stipend of between £20 and £30 a year—he rallied around him what may be regarded as a very advanced guard of the movement. He had also the honour of being a confessor for the cause. From the very outset of his clerical

[1] See Dr. Littledale's *Memoir of Dr. J. M. Neale.*

career he was a marked man, as a "Camdenian"; and the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Sumner) refused to license him in his diocese. He was afterwards, on more than one occasion, subjected to mob violence, and was brought into collision with his diocesan, Dr. Gilbert, of Chichester, who for a time inhibited him from officiating in his diocese, though it is a comfort to know that the two were thoroughly reconciled before Neale's premature death. Neale, like his friend John Keble, combined the utmost gentleness of manner with an iron inflexibility of will; and he always carried his point. When the episcopal inhibition was removed in 1863, "So, I hope," he writes, "ends a battle of more than sixteen years, I having neither withdrawn a single word nor altered a single practice (except in a few instances by way of going further)". Like the Oxford Tractarian leaders, Neale was a man of the highest culture; as a classical scholar he had few equals; and his well-known hymns, translated and original, are no less conspicuous for their extreme refinement than for their poetical merit. But he was essentially a practical man, and the church has as much reason to be grateful to him for his practical work as for his writings. [1]

[1] His friend Dr. Littledale wrote a most vivid and interesting sketch of his life; but this seems difficult of access—at least, it was not without some difficulty that the present writer found access to it—but a full and accurate account of his life and writings will be found in *St. Margaret's* [East Grinstead] *Magazine*, from July, 1887, onwards. The most popular of his verse compositions are his translations of the *Hora Novissima, or Rhythm of*

Another Cambridge man, who was also a founder of the Camden Society, its first secretary, and editor of its organ, *The Ecclesiologist*, and who, like Neale, resembled the Oxford Tractarians more than the Cambridge High Churchmen, was *Benjamin Webb* (1820–1885). Mr. Webb made his mark both as a London clergyman at S. Andrew's, Wells Street, one of the earliest and most prominent of the advanced churches, and as editor of the *Church Quarterly Review*. William Butler, again, who, as an efficient and successful priest at Wantage, almost rivalled Dr. Hook at Leeds, was trained at Cambridge, but was more of the Oxford Tractarian than of the old High Church type; and so, in a different way, was that most stanch and munificent lay churchman, A. J. Beresford Hope, though he was identified with Cambridge almost all his life.

All these, however, and others who could be mentioned, bore traces of their Cambridge training, and were not quite of the Oxford pattern. Perhaps one difference was that there was not the spell of the great leaders upon them, for there was no triumvirate at Cambridge like that which directed the Oxford party. Neither was there any section which had any directly Roman tendencies. Of course it is not meant by this that no Cambridge men went

Bernard de Morlaix, Monk of Cluny, from which the well-known hymns, "Brief life is here our portion", "Jerusalem the golden", and "For thee, O dear, dear country" are taken; and "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" "O happy band of pilgrims", and "Fierce was the wild billow", taken from the Greek.

over to Rome, but only that when they *did* go over they went as individuals, not as members of a party. Even Dr. Neale, who held quite as advanced views as any Oxford man who kept within the pale of the English Church, never seems to have felt the faintest inclination to cross the border. The infusion of the Cambridge element was a distinct advantage to the movement. The different course of education, the different surroundings, the very absence of prominent leaders, made the Cambridge men look at the whole question from a rather different point of view, and produced a "variety" which was not only "pleasing", but decidedly beneficial to the cause which all alike had at heart.

But the greatest benefit which the movement derived from Cambridge was indirect rather than direct, and arose from quarters which were professedly antagonistic to it. The religious element, if not the church element, was, after the trying year 1845, very much stronger at Cambridge than it was at Oxford. The leading men there were far more settled and definite in their Christian convictions than they were at the sister university. There was a triumvirate at Cambridge which was as influential in its way as the Oxford one was. "The Three", as Drs. Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort were emphatically called, did untold good in keeping young inquirers firm in their Christian, and, in a sense, church, though not High Church, convictions. What Dr. Hort said in 1879 applies to earlier years:

"The studies of the place [Cambridge] discourage, instead of fostering, youthful 'sophistic'; the number of leading men who are known to be conscientious Christians makes contempt of Christian faith a trifle ridiculous; and the way in which churchmen of all opinions, both graduates and undergraduates, are accustomed to meet and work together, not only keeps party-spirit in check, but gives power to the life of the whole body. In this and other respects we have no sharply-defined camps, and consequently no need of prematurely closing the mind against growth in knowledge and experience."[1]

All this is undoubtedly true; but it told in another way. Men left Cambridge with their faith unshaken, nay, more firmly established than when they entered. But then, when they went into the outer world, and especially if they went as clergymen, they were apt to join one or other of the "sharply-defined camps", and by far the most attractive has been that of the movement.

In another way Cambridge, indirectly but very really, has contributed more than its quota to the success of the Anglican movement. After the stormy events of the forties there was a tendency at Oxford to let theology alone, and to devote attention to more peaceful studies. But Cambridge had not been in the thick of the combat, and it suffered from no such reaction. The consequence was that for the twenty years after the secession of Newman sacred literature

[1] *Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort*, ii. 277.

in all its departments was enriched far more by Cambridge than by Oxford. Now it is of immense importance to the Church of England (and therefore to the movement which is being sketched), that she should keep up her traditions as a learned church; and after those years of storm and stress, it must be confessed that the credit of doing so rested mainly with Cambridge. It would be invidious to select names, but let any elderly man call to mind what were the new books on divinity which were most popular, and most helpful to him in his youth, and he will probably find that the great majority of them were written by Cambridge men.

An university training had more to do with the life and mind of the church fifty years ago than it has now. For though the laity are an essential part of the church, it is obvious that her character at any particular time must depend largely upon the character of her clergy. And the clergy were more closely connected with the universities then than they are now; for not only was there a larger proportion of university men among their ranks, but the college system impressed itself more deeply upon the future clergy than it does now, when very many live outside the college walls, and when college offices are to a great extent filled by laymen. Hence it has been thought desirable to dwell very fully upon the parts which the universities played in the movement. But we may now leave the cloister and see how that movement affected the world outside.

Chapter VII.

The Movement in the Outer World.—Dean Hook and Bishop Wilberforce.

"Universities", said Newman, "are the natural centres of intellectual movements"; but if those movements have any vital force in them, they extend their influence far and wide, whether the centre remains the same or not. This certainly was the case with the movement before us. Oxford had set the ball a-rolling; Cambridge contributed its share to the impetus; but it is now to the country at large that we must look in order to estimate its effects.

It will still be convenient to connect what went on with individual names; and two men stand prominently forward as having, more than any others, stamped the impress of the revival upon the parish and upon the diocese respectively.

Although it was the tract-writers who gave the first impulse to the church movement of 1833, it by no means follows that the chief agents in carrying its principles into effect should have identified themselves with the so-called Tractarians; and, as a matter of fact, the two men in question never did so; indeed, they were not seldom brought into somewhat violent collision with "Tractarianism". This, of course, could not have been the case, had the Anglican movement been introducing some new system of doctrine; but that was just what its origi-

nators vehemently denied that they were doing. They desired simply "to stand upon the old ways";[1] they appealed to primitive antiquity, and were quite content to abide by that test. It was not on principles, but at most on the application of principles, and, as a rule, only on non-essential details, that the different agents differed. Hence, when men declared that they never were Tractarians, that they disapproved of the action of the Tractarians, this did not necessarily mean they were thereby disqualified from taking a leading part in the movement which the tract-writers started. It certainly did not mean so in the case of the two men who are the fittest representatives of church work on Anglican lines in the parish and the diocese respectively—Dean Hook and Bishop Wilberforce. For several reasons it will be well to begin first with the smaller area and the lesser dignitary.

Walter Farquhar Hook (1798-1875), the son of a country clergyman who afterwards became Dean of Worcester, went up in 1817 from Winchester to Oxford, where he was nominated by the Prince Regent, through the influence of his grandfather, Sir Walter Farquhar, to a studentship at Christ Church. Pusey, as we have seen, matriculated as a commoner at Christ Church in 1819. The two were therefore undergraduates together, but Hook was the senior by nearly two years, and was a student while Pusey was only a commoner. Those

[1] "Stare super antiquas vias."

who know the inner life of young Oxford, at least in the first half of the present century, will see in these differences quite enough to account for a certain air of seniority and superiority in Hook's early letters to Pusey, very different from the general tone of the letters addressed to that somewhat awe-inspiring personage. In those early days Pusey's views were not settled, and there was of course not that halo of sanctity about him with which he was afterwards invested. When Hook took his B.A. degree in 1821, and Pusey in 1822, the two friends entered upon very different lines of life, Pusey remaining at Oxford, and Hook commencing parish work at once. For seven years Hook was engaged in country cures, where, although he was a most diligent and successful parish priest, he naturally found abundance of leisure for regular and systematic theological study. He took full advantage of the opportunity, and formed his views, from which he never diverged, very early. This is shown by the fact that in 1822, when he was still only a deacon, and when Pusey was hardly yet freed from the throes of the schools, he preached a sermon at the Bishop of Winchester's visitation at Newport on "The peculiar character of the Church of England independently of its connection with the State", in which he advocated the very same views which were insisted upon so strongly by the tract-writers eleven years later. In fact, he was firmly established in his theological position, which was, in the main,

the same as that of the early Tractarians, long before, and quite independently of, the Oxford movement; and when all the prime movers except Keble were either yet in a state of flux or belonged to quite a different school of thought. Moreover, he formed his convictions entirely through his own reading and thought; he certainly owed nothing in this respect either to his home or his school or his university training. The only human being to whom he appears to have been really indebted was Bishop Jebb, to whom he frequently refers at various times in such terms as these: "You know my system as I learnt it from Bishop Jebb" (1837); "My dear Gamaliel, Bishop Jebb" (1840); "My dear spiritual father, Bishop Jebb" (1849).[1]

In 1828 an opportunity was given him of showing how his principles worked on a larger scale than that of a country village, and nobly did he avail himself of it. He was appointed to the living of Holy Trinity, Coventry, and soon made his mark in that large parish. It is difficult to realize the extent of his work there, because it embraced the introduction of improvements which are now quite ordinary parts of parochial machinery, but which were then new, and could not be carried out without a struggle. Evening services, frequent celebrations of the holy communion, sermons on saints' days, lectures in Lent, classes for instruction, and so forth,

[1] See *Dean Hook, His Life and Letters*, by Stephens, 7th ed., in 1 vol., pp. 240, 306, 433.

seem matters of course now, but they were innovations then, and had to be fought for by the new vicar. It was during his Coventry period that the Oxford movement began; and Newman writes to him in 1834 in language which is not more generous than true: "Your being obliged to retire from parochial duty would be a calamity *we* ought to try to prevent, as we have no specimen (so far as I know) but that which you supply of the influential nature of true church principles on a town population".[1] He carried his points by a happy blending of geniality and dogged perseverance; being absolutely sure of his position he would not diverge a hair's-breadth from it. The result was, in his own language, "As I will not go over to others, others come over to me".

In 1837 still larger scope for his energies was given him, for in that year he was elected by the trustees to the vicarage of Leeds, one of the other candidates being none other than Samuel Wilberforce. The election was vehemently opposed both by the Low Church party at Leeds, and by *The Record* and the *Christian Observer*, for Hook was known, not only as a stanch High Churchman, but as a personal friend of the obnoxious tract-writers. He made no secret of this friendship—indeed, it was not in his nature to make a secret of anything. "'He is known to be a friend of Pusey, Keble, and Newman'," he writes, quoting indig-

[1] Quoted in *Life of Hook*, p. 113.

nantly an objection that had been raised against him; "and what higher honour can a man have on this earth?"[1] But Yorkshire men of business, and above all Yorkshire working-men, were not the sort of class to be prejudiced against a man by objections of this kind. He was perfectly straightforward with them, full of *bonhomie*, ready to take as well as to deal a shrewd blow without losing his temper. He showed his hand at once: "You see before you", he said in his first sermon at Leeds, "a firm, determined, consistent, uncompromising, devoted, but I hope not uncharitable son, servant, and minister of the honoured Church of England";[2] and this he proved himself all through his remarkable career at Leeds. Within a few months of his arrival enthusiastic admiration took the place of violent opposition, and Leeds soon became a stronghold of the church. But the work at Leeds under Dr. Hook was a natural growth, not an artificial product; it did not depend upon the vicar's commanding personality, and then collapse when that personality was removed. There is a sense in which his characteristic description of the relation between Leeds and himself—"I did not manage the parish, the parish managed me"—is perfectly true. His aim was to impress not himself but his principles upon his people; his persuasiveness was of the Demosthenic, not of the Ciceronian type; he did not make men say, "What a fine orator he is!", but "Let us go and fight Philip".

[1] *Life*, p. 217. [2] *Id.*, p. 209.

Though he was very far from identifying himself with the tract-writers, the latter thoroughly appreciated the help which he rendered to the general cause of the church, and also the difficulties in his position in comparison with their own. "You", writes Newman to him in 1838, "are in the thickest fire of the enemy; and I often think how easy it is for us to sit quietly here, sheltered from bullets, while you often get what is meant to hit us."[1] And Pusey, in the same year: "Thanks for your defence of us; as for your being our disciple the thing is absurd. Newman said, in the *Christian Observer*, that you had formed or received your views long before many of the writers in the Tracts (long before myself on many points). We were led by different paths to the same end, and from our early separation had little to do in forming each other's opinions; and you have held them earlier than Newman probably, and far longer and more consistently than ourselves."[2]

Pusey soon found an opportunity of giving Hook a practical proof of his appreciation of his work. After his great sorrow in 1839 he conceived the idea of making some great offering to God in memory of his dead wife, and as a secret act of penitence; and he determined to help his friend Hook by building a new church in the overgrown parish of Leeds. He intended to call it the church of S. Cross, but, as Bishop Longley objected to the

[1] *Life of Hook*, p. 275. [2] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 40.

designation, "S. Saviour's" was the name ultimately chosen. The foundation-stone was laid on Sept. 14, 1842, but owing to various objections raised by the diocesan, Bp. Longley, to the details of construction, the church was not ready for consecration until October, 1845. This event at last took place just after Newman's secession; and we cannot wonder that both Hook and his diocesan were rather nervous about it. "You must remember", writes Hook to Pusey on Oct. 17, "there are not five persons in Leeds who will sympathize with you."

However, the consecration went off satisfactorily; but, alas! sore troubles were at hand. The first incumbent was a Mr. Ward, apparently not a very strong man, and not very firmly fixed in his church principles. When matters did not go on satisfactorily, Dr. Pusey sent to the rescue as curate Mr. Macmullen, who at any rate was strong enough, as his combat with Dr. Hampden in 1842 showed. Mr. Macmullen threw life into everything at S. Saviour's; but it was not the sort of life of which the vicar of Leeds approved. Among other things he preached a sermon advocating the doctrine of the Intercession of Saints. Bp. Longley was informed of his so doing. Hook wrote indignantly to Pusey: "You have sent Mr. Macmullen here, and he is acting as curate without the bishop's license. I hope the bishop, now that he knows about this, will send him to the right-about, so that when, having

done Romish work in England, he goes over to the Popish Church, where his heart is, he may not refer to this clandestine act as a proof that there is no discipline among us." Pusey replies with touching humility that "there is some dreadful misunderstanding somewhere. We have been labouring together these many years for one common mother. . . . And now let me tell you, my dear friend, that I stand on no other ground than yourself, that of Ken, Andrewes, and Bramhall, the primitive, undivided church." And then he tells him that he is "quite sure" that the S. Saviour's clergy are "devoted servants of our church"; and writes a little later: "I have entire confidence in Ward as a loyal son of the Church of England". Hook was not satisfied. "I complain", he writes, "of your building a church, and getting a foot in my parish to propagate principles which I detest, having come under the plea of assisting me in propagating principles which I uphold; of your having selected one to oppose me and my principles, who approached me as a friend, and who now admits that in so doing he did wrong, and that before he undertook to oppose me by causing a division in Leeds, he ought to have reflected that *he* was not the proper person to be your agent"; and a little later, "Depend upon it that you are mistaken in Macmullen". The sequel soon showed that Hook was right, for within six days (Dec. 30, 1846) he writes again: "Macmullen and his dupes have gone over to the Mother of

Abominations". Then Charles Marriott, as one of the trustees of S. Saviour's, is sent over to Leeds, and reports (Jan. 7, 1847): "There was more to complain of here than you thought for through Macmullen's indiscretion (to say the least). The bishop was right in strongly pressing his removal." Mr. Ward resigned the living, and Pusey wrote to Hook: "I own myself quite mistaken about Macmullen, and that I did much mischief in sending him to Leeds. About Ward you were right so far, that it was of importance that he should have good Anglicans about him. . . . Macmullen took the lead (as being intellectually a superior person) in a way he ought not."[1] Hook, warm-hearted and impulsive as ever, wrote back in the old terms of affection, but added: "The chief damage done to me is one in which you cannot sympathize. I have lost the confidence of the good old church-and-king men, who used to support me because they thought me a supporter of our constitution in church and state." Mr. Ward soon went over to Rome, and by 1850, "out of fifteen clergy who had been connected with S. Saviour's since its consecration nine had now seceded. Only one remained at his post after the collapse of 1851."[2]

Such, in brief, is the history of this painful episode. It has been thought right to dwell upon it at some length because it is only fair to touch upon the weak as well as the strong side of the movement,

[1] *Life of Pusey*, iii. 131. [2] *Life of Hook*, p. 453.

and also because it illustrates some of the difficulties which had to be grappled with in so complex a situation.

One feels a sort of sympathy with both the chief actors. On the one hand, who can help feeling for Dr. Pusey, who in the simplicity of his heart only wished to do good, without the slightest regard for the praise of men? For the fact that he was the sole founder of the church at a cost of £6000 was kept a profound secret. It was only known to be the work of "a penitent". The whole scheme caused him the utmost difficulty and annoyance; but he never faltered; he submitted with meekness to the reproaches which were cast upon him; he owned his mistakes, and never attempted to palliate them or explain them away. But, on the other hand, he showed a strange want of judgment and of insight into the characters of men.

There was certainly very much to be said for Hook's side of the question. He has been charged with hesitation, changeableness, timidity. But is this quite fair? The result amply justified his fears. In plain words, he feared the S. Saviour's men were going to Rome, and, as a matter of fact, they *did* go to Rome. It may be that his stiffness, his invectives, his vehemence precipitated the catastrophe. Mr. Macmullen distinctly said that he owed his conversion to Dr. Hook, who had opened his eyes to the real character of the Church of England. But, really, what weak-kneed Anglicans the

men must have been to be driven over the border by such a cause! And if ever there was provocation for vehemence—violence, if you will—surely Dr. Hook had that provocation. For nearly ten years he had been fighting the battle of church principles against the incessant and bitter cry that these principles were Roman, not Anglican. He had succeeded, as no living clergyman had then done, in commending those principles to a vast town population which had previously had not the faintest idea what they were, and which, when it first heard of them, had been violently set against them. This "timid" man had manfully fought his way, through evil report and good report, had won a confidence and achieved a position which no other parish priest in England had. And now the whole work seemed to be upset, and that by his own familiar friend. The secessions from S. Saviour's again brought down upon him those storms of abuse which his own courage, tact, and good judgment had quite lulled. And he had foreseen it all, and forewarned the doer of it all. Happily he soon recovered from the blow, but that it *was* a blow, and a blow under which he reeled again, is surely indisputable.

Looking at the matter from another point of view, we may observe that it emphasized a difference between Pusey and the school which Pusey represented, and Hook and the school which Hook represented. The two schools certainly regarded both the Church

of Rome and the Church of England in different lights. To Pusey the former was a church in error, but a real church, and one which he fondly hoped might abandon those errors, and be reunited with us. To Hook she was simply "the Mother of Abominations"; he would cordially have re-echoed the sentiment of Bishop Hall, "No peace with Rome".

Again, in regard to the Church of England, Hook was an optimist, Pusey, if not exactly a pessimist, at any rate, one who was very far indeed from regarding her as "without spot or blemish, or any such thing". His spiritual father had, as we have seen, in *The Christian Year* always regarded the church as in a state of decay. Hook, on the other hand, thought and said that "the church and her liturgy were absolutely excellent".[1] Pusey very clearly indicated the difference between them in this respect in a letter written to Hook in 1845: "In you and Jelf, Churton, Palmer, Gresley, there is a tone of easiness and satisfaction with all things, and an inaptitude to see what is amiss; a want of the element of austerity, severity".[2] Accordingly Hook was a very much stiffer Anglican than Pusey was; the latter always had great sympathy with the Evangelicals, the former—none.

The difference in part arose from the very different situations in which the two men were placed. Pusey took the theoretical, Hook the practical view of the

[1] See *Life of Hook*, p. 142. [2] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 497.

subject. Pusey was essentially a student, Hook, though a great reader, was really more at home as a worker. Both held that the Primitive Church was the true model for the Church of England; but Pusey knew very much better what the Primitive Church really was than Hook did; he had studied it far more deeply, and with less prejudice.

On the other hand, Hook was a more practical man in every way than Pusey. Any theory he held was bound to be a working theory; otherwise it was useless for his purpose. This was one of the secrets of his success. A man who was to make any deep impression upon such places as Leeds and Coventry must have very sharp, clear-cut convictions. *There* was the definite church system which he desired to recommend. If that system did not in all points agree with the Primitive Church—so much the worse for the Primitive Church. He could not afford to have much sympathy with those who did not agree with him; for such sympathy was, as far as it went, a playing into the hands of the enemy. It was all very well for Pusey, sitting in his study, or in contact only with men who were like-minded with himself, to love and sympathize with the Evangelicals, or to be very friendly towards Dissenters, with whom he was never brought into collision. But how could Hook do this at Leeds, where, as he says, "There are bitter enemies, the Peculiars"—[the name given by the Oriel men at the commencement of the movement to the Evan-

gelicals]—"whose bitterness is beyond all description, ready to watch each trip that is made"?[1] How could he fraternize with Dissenters, when he had been forced to give this advice to a clergyman about them: "Keep aloof from Dissenters as persons of a different religion"?[2] Hook perfectly well understood that he was on a lower intellectual level than Pusey, as the following words in a letter written by him in 1843 show: "The great men of a school only write for the initiated. The little men, the retail dealers in divinity, apply to the great men through their writings for wholesale divinity."[3] Among the great men he places Pusey and Newman; among the little, Gresley, Paget, and himself. But, as a retail dealer in divinity, he took the privilege, which all retail dealers take, of selecting only those goods from the wholesale dealers which he required. It seems necessary to dwell upon those differences, because they were the differences not merely of two individuals, but of two representative men, each of whom had a vast number of stanch churchmen who, more or less, harmonized with him. Both parties were agreed on the main points, and both were factors in the movement we are considering.

Before concluding this rather painful episode it is a comfort to add that the old affectional relationship between Hook and Pusey was restored before the end came. In 1873, when both were old men, Hook

[1] *Life*, p. 302. [2] *Id.*, p. 189. [3] *Life of Pusey*, ii. 375.

sent a message to Pusey through Liddon, "Can you tell that saint whom England persecuted, our dearly beloved Pusey, that I should like, as I am passing out of this world, to be permitted to renew the friendship with him which in our youthful days was my joy and crown of rejoicing?" Pusey wrote at once to Hook to thank him for his "loving message", and added, "What a long life of friendship it has been since 1819, when I used to come down from my garret in Peckwater. . . . I am so sorry that some whom I sent to S. Saviour's worried you. . . . I always studied you, though I was misinformed in two cases."[1]

Dr. Hook was also a representative man, in being perhaps the first, and certainly the most prominent and successful, of those who applied the principles of the movement to the practical work of a large parish. The parish responded to the touch, as very many other parishes have since done; for in no respect have the results of the movement been more conspicuous than in the increased energy and efficiency shown in plain, practical, parochial work.

As Dr. Hook is a palmary instance of what a man imbued with the principles of the Anglican movement may do in the parish, so is Dr. Wilberforce of what may be done in that larger unit, the diocese.

Samuel Wilberforce (1805–1873) has been termed, with good reason, "The Remodeller of the Episco-

[1] *Life of Pusey*, iv. 260.

pate".[1] Not that this implies that there were no good, active bishops at the time when he was appointed to the see of Oxford (1845). On the contrary, there were then prelates on the bench who would have been an honour to any age of the church. Bishop Blomfield had been a thoroughly hard-working bishop for more than twenty years; Wilberforce's own diocesan, Bishop Charles Sumner, was no idler at Winchester, nor was his brother Bishop J. B. Sumner, at Chester; Bishop Denison's industry and liberality in the diocese of Salisbury were immense; Bishop Kaye at Lincoln was a very high type of bishop, both intellectually and spiritually; Bishop Lonsdale was presiding with extraordinary success over the diocese of Lichfield; and others might be named. But in spite of all this, Bishop Wilberforce set a new standard of episcopal work, which cannot be better described than in the words of Canon Ashwell: "Samuel Wilberforce's *idea* of Episcopacy with which he set out was his own. The Bishop was to be as much the mainspring of all spiritual and religious energy in his diocese as a parochial clergyman is bound to be in his parish. His duty was to supply not only counsel to his clergy, but also that *momentum* which the sense of real supervision supplies, to care for the diocese as a whole, to learn for himself where needs existed, to take the necessary steps for sup-

[1] Dean Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, "Samuel Wilberforce, The Remodeller of the Episcopate".

plying those needs, and to take care also that it was known that he so acted, and that he was at all times not only accessible to all men, but also ready personally to investigate on the spot any case that was brought before him."[1] If exception be taken to this testimony as merely the testimony of an admiring biographer, the evidence of Mr. (Sir William) Palmer can hardly be suspected; for he was by no means an indiscriminate admirer of Samuel Wilberforce. He was a singularly different type of man himself, one who had no sympathy whatever with some of Wilberforce's leading characteristics; and, in fact, as he frankly owns, had to overcome a considerable prejudice, which those who know the minds of the two men can well understand. But this is his deliberate conviction: "I must confess that for many years I did not feel any confidence in Wilberforce; I thought he courted popularity too much; I could not depend on his principles. But my objections were swept away by contemplating his truly magnificent course of exertion in the cause of the Church of England. He not only afforded a grand example of what Christianity can do, but electrified the whole church by it. He stirred it up to a new life. . . . Bishop Wilberforce had a greater influence in reviving the Church of England than any of his contemporaries. . . . Newman laid the foundation, but Wilberforce built up the temple. Wilberforce realized in the face of the world, high

[1] *Life of Bishop S. Wilberforce*, i. 344.

and low, the true ideal of a Christian Episcopate in the Church of England—a model which was to furnish an example to all ages of the church; but never to be rivalled or approached again. Wilberforce's work was exactly what we needed; a combination of the practical with the theoretical; it led men away from barren controversies and mutual misunderstandings to a holier emulation—a rivalry in good works."[1] It is unnecessary to add the evidence of Dean Burgon to the same effect. Indeed, the fact is patent, and, as in the case of Dr. Hook, the only difficulty in realizing the extent of his success, is because he *was* successful; others followed in his wake, and the standard, which was then absolutely unique, has become a common one.

But here a question arises, Can Samuel Wilberforce be fairly regarded as a product of the Anglican movement? With the Tractarians as a party he carefully abstained from identifying himself, and not only spoke language, but did acts, which marked his strong disapproval of them. But (though perhaps he would himself have denied it) his episcopal character was surely formed in the Oxford school. We can scarcely imagine him being what he was if there had been no movement, and if he himself had not been deeply affected by that movement. Never perhaps was there a man who was more distracted by conflicting influences than Samuel Wilberforce;

[1] Supplement to *Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the Tracts for the Times* (written in 1883), pp. 255–7.

and some injustice has been done to him through not taking these influences into account. His early training was among "the Clapham sect". His love and admiration for his father, its lay leader, were unbounded.[1] From his twelfth year he carefully kept his father's letters, which at last amounted to no less than six hundred. When he was thirty-seven years old, an age at which a man's views are presumably settled, he disclaimed indignantly any identification of himself with the tract-writers: "My *general* tone is unlike theirs and against their peculiar views. My opinions have been formed in a far different school. They are those of my beloved father."[2] His early patron and most kind and constant friend was that pronounced anti-Tractarian, Bishop Sumner of Winchester, who gave him, when he was only twenty-five years of age, the valuable living of Brightstone, frequently interchanged visits with him, made him, when he was only thirty-four, Archdeacon of Surrey, and in the following year (1840) rector of Alverstoke. In 1841 he came under court influence, being nominated by Prince Albert as his chaplain; and for some years he was a "persona grata" in the highest quarters, both as a preacher and as a personal friend. This would be, in a different way, as antagonistic to the development of Tractarianism as the influence of his father and of Bishop

[1] "The Wilberforces started with the immense and very rare advantage of perfect confidence and openness with their father. He was the joy of their life and the light of their eyes."—T. Mozley, *Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College*, &c., i. 110. [2] *Life of Bishop S. Wilberforce*, i. 217.

Sumner. Then he married Miss Emily Sargent, the daughter of a leading Evangelical; and though he lost her very soon, he almost worshipped her memory, and would be little inclined to show any tendency which would be distasteful to the Sargent tradition. Again, he was placed in a most painful position as an English clergyman by the fact that many of his nearest and dearest relatives—his three brothers, his two brothers-in-law, his only daughter and her husband—went over to Rome. So far from having the faintest inclination to follow them, their defections, culminating in that of his eldest brother, Robert Isaac, whom he loved and respected more almost than any human being, filled him with an ever-increasing abhorrence of Rome and everything that tended towards it. Perhaps also he felt bound to vindicate himself from any suspicion that Romanizing ran, as it were, in the blood, by making vigorous and constant protests, and adopting courses of action in accordance with those protests. But protest as he would, the Low Churchmen, who in the early years of his episcopate still formed the largest and most influential party in the church, never regarded him as their friend. And they were right; for in spite of his manifestly sincere expressions of devotion to his father's memory, the unbounded influence which he exercised in his diocese all tended to undermine the power of that party of which his father had been the lay chief. The work in the Oxford diocese which really told was work done on High Church

lines, and the life and soul of that work was Bishop Wilberforce. He was hardly long enough at Winchester to make the same impression there, and, in spite of his higher dignity, he will always be known as *par excellence* "*the* Bishop of Oxford". There is another side to his career in that capacity, in which he was by no means so successful; that side will come painfully before us in the next chapter.

The increased efficiency both in parochial and diocesan work which may be fairly attributed to the Anglican movement will be noticed in a later chapter. To give instances at this stage of the movement would hardly be in accordance with chronological order. For the vast changes of which Dr. Hook and Dr. Wilberforce were the pioneers did not come into full and general operation until after the two famous cases of Dr. Hampden and Mr. Gorham.

Chapter VIII.

The Hampden and Gorham Cases and their results.

It should be carefully borne in mind that the Church movement and the Tract movement are not identical. The Tract-writers, indeed, gave the first impulse to the movement; without them it might never have taken place, at any rate in the form in which it *did* take place. But they themselves would

have been the first to own that their work was to revive the old, not to introduce the new. They contended that they had at their backs the really great divines of the Church of England, and those divines would have been there, ready for use, whether the Tracts had been written or not. Thus the famous Hampden controversy, which arose in 1847, was not one in which the so-called Tractarians were ranged on one side and their opponents on the other. It was convenient so to represent it, because the Tractarians were still the unpopular party, and to raise a cry of Puseyism was still the most effectual weapon that could be used against any cause. But the real point at issue both in the Hampden and the Gorham cases was this: Is the Church, because she is established, to be overridden by the State in a way that no sect in the kingdom would tolerate for one moment? And to this question many churchmen who had no sympathy whatever with the Tractarians as a party, answered emphatically "No". At the same time, as in the commencement of the movement, so now, it was the Tractarians who stood in the forefront of the battle. Lord John Russell was not far wrong when he said: "Dr. Pusey must be considered as the leader and oracle of Dr. Hampden's opponents".[1] These points will be amply illustrated in the details of the two cases.

On November 15, 1847, it was announced, that the premier, Lord John Russell, had recommended

[1] *Life of Bishop S. Wilberforce*, i. 459.

to the crown the appointment of Dr. R. D. Hampden, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, to the bishopric of Hereford, in the room of Dr. Musgrave, translated to York. It will be remembered that Dr. Hampden lay under the censure of his own University, passed in 1836, and confirmed by a vain attempt to remove it in 1842. The premier must have known that those who objected to Dr. Hampden being a professor of divinity, would *à fortiori* object to his being a bishop; he must also have known that as the opposition to the lower appointment was not confined to the Tractarian party, so neither would the opposition to the higher. But he thought the appointment "was calculated to strengthen the Protestant character of our Church, so seriously threatened of late by many defections to the Church of Rome";[1] and therefore he persisted in his recommendation in spite of remonstrances from all quarters.

The *Times*, which was a very fair index of popular opinion, expressed its astonishment; the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) and the Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Longley) wrote in conjunction a strong letter to the premier on their own account; and a "Remonstrance", signed by thirteen bishops, among whom were some who had taken an active part against the Tractarians, was also sent to him. The *Christian Observer*, the monthly organ of the Evangelicals, declared that "it was hardly fair to the church to

[1] *Life of Bishop S. Wilberforce*, p. 440.

nominate to a bishopric one who was lying under the recorded censure of his University, a censure pronounced by all parties in the church"; and "could not be surprised that the appointment had been viewed with regret and disappointment by all parties".[1] The *Record*, the weekly organ of the same party, declared that, as it had been "loud to denounce" Dr. Hampden's writings, it had "no disposition to depart from the allegations then made". Even among the Broad Churchmen, where Dr. Hampden might have expected to find his warmest sympathizers, a leading representative, Julius Hare, "deplored and condemned the appointment as a most injudicious measure on the part of the minister,—as a wanton outrage on the feelings, prejudices they might be, but still strong and earnest feelings, of a large body of the church, especially of the clergy,—as an act which would infallibly arouse vehement opposition, and break up the peace of the church at a time when we were hoping for something like a lull after the storms of late years";[2] though, at the same time, he defended Dr. Hampden personally. Hence it was hardly accurate to call the opposition, as Dr. Hampden called it, "a Tractarian persecution"; at the same time there is no doubt that the strongest opposition came from those who were more or less connected with the Anglican

[1] "View of Public Affairs" in the appendix to the *Christian Observer* for December, 1847.

[2] Letter to the Dean of Chichester (Dr. Chandler) on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford.

movement, especially from Pusey, Keble, Charles Marriott, and J. B. Mozley.

It was an unfortunate affair throughout; and not the least unfortunate part of it was that the Bishop of Oxford had, from his position, to take a prominent share in it; for it was just one of those cases in which the weak side of the great bishop's character would be sure to come to the front. Dr. Hampden, as Regius Professor of Divinity, held the living of Ewelme, which was then attached to the professorship; he was therefore an incumbent in Bishop Wilberforce's diocese; and it was purposed to institute a suit against him, under the Church Discipline Act of 1840, before his diocesan for heretical teaching. Bishop Wilberforce was one of the thirteen bishops who had signed the Remonstrance to the premier against the appointment. He declined, rightly, to promote the suit, but consented to sign Letters of Request to the Archbishop of Canterbury to remit the case to be heard in his Court of Arches. It was intended to oppose the confirmation of Dr. Hampden in Bow Church, and counsel's opinion was that "the opposition to confirmation would have less chance of being summarily set aside, if there were a suit pending in the Arches Court which could be referred to as a ground of objection".[1] Bishop Wilberforce signed the letters on Dec. 16, regarding this simply as a ministerial, not a judicial act. He then wrote to the premier,

[1] Letter of Rev. Charles Marriott to the Bishop of Oxford, Dec. 4, 1847.

begging him to reconsider the appointment, and to Dr. Hampden, asking him to avow his reception of ten articles which he drew up, and to withdraw the Bampton Lectures and the *Observations on Religious Dissent*; but from both he received what can only be called "a snub". Then came the last scene in the drama. The great majority of the Heads of Houses at Oxford were in favour of Dr. Hampden. The bishop, when he went to Oxford for his December ordination, stayed with the wariest of them all, Dr. Hawkins, who worked upon him by telling him that Dr. Hampden's pamphlet was being sold without its writer's consent, and by persuading him to re-read the Bamptons. The result was that, three days later, the bishop withdrew his Letters of Request, which practically put an end to the Hampden case. This drew upon him a storm of abuse, and one of those crushing letters from Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter, which that very able prelate knew so well how to write. Canon Ashwell amply clears the good bishop's memory from any fair charge of double-dealing or insincerity, but hardly from weakness. The broad facts remain that he signed a remonstrance against the nomination, gave his sanction for the commencement of a suit against the nominee, and then withdrew that sanction. The plea that he granted the Letters of Request under the idea that he had no power to refuse, and only withdrew them when he was legally advised to the contrary, saves his honesty at the expense of his strength; for does

it not argue weakness in a man in such a position to do an important act without knowing his own powers? The sequel is quickly told. At the election of Dr. Hampden, two votes (one being the dean's) out of fourteen were given against him, and at the confirmation of that election at Bow Church the absurd farce was gone through of inviting objections, and when the objectors were prepared to give them, refusing to hear them. The Hampden case fell through, but not without leaving a sore which long rankled in the minds of many churchmen.

That sore was exasperated by another case which in point of date overlapped that of Dr. Hampden. On Nov. 2, 1847, the Rev. G. C. Gorham was presented by the lord chancellor to the living of Brampford Speke in the diocese of Exeter. He had the year before been presented to another living in the same diocese (S. Just-in-Penwith), and the bishop had reason to believe that he held views, especially on the subject of Holy-Baptism, which he deemed inconsistent with the formularies of the church. He therefore insisted upon his undoubted right to examine a priest before instituting him to a benefice. The examination commenced on Dec. 17, lasted four days, and was then postponed until March, when it was resumed for three days, no less than one hundred and forty questions being set in all. The bishop was dissatisfied with the result. Mr. Gorham brought the case before the Court of Arches, where Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, after a very long

interval, gave judgment against him (Aug. 2, 1849). Mr. Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who reversed the decision of the Court of Arches (March 8, 1850). The Bishop of Exeter still refused to institute, and Mr. Gorham was instituted by the Dean of Arches acting for the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Phillpotts applied in vain to the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer; and the matter dropped.

The Hampden and the Gorham cases, but especially the latter, had an important bearing upon the movement in more ways than one.

In the first place they rallied churchmen together who had for some time not been quite in sympathy —or at any rate represented different sections of the movement. In 1847, when the rumour of Dr. Hampden's appointment spread, Dr. Pusey wrote to Archdeacon Churton, the biographer of Joshua Watson, and an excellent specimen of the old-fashioned High Churchman, saying: "It seems as if this trouble were allowed to bring together by a common pressure those who were scattered".[1] And the event showed that Dr. Pusey was right. For instance, the Bishop of Exeter had never quite thrown himself into the movement; but now he and Pusey and Keble worked shoulder to shoulder. He supported Pusey heartily in the matter of Miss Sellon and the sisterhood at Devonport in 1849; and Pusey

[1] *Life of Pusey*, iii. 160.

helped him largely in the theological questions which arose out of the Gorham case, and, in fact, supplied him with materials for his famous "Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury" in relation to that case. Keble sympathized with the bishop so entirely that, after the series of defeats noted above, he again thought of retiring into a position similar to that of the Nonjurors.

On the other hand, the two cases led to another series of secessions to Rome. Among these seceders by far the most eminent was *Henry Edward Manning* (1808–1892), afterwards Cardinal-priest and Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster. The reader may have been surprised that this great name has not been mentioned before; but this is a sketch of the Anglican movement, and with that movement Manning really had very little to do; his name scarcely ever occurs in the records of its earlier stages. His training was not at all calculated to make him a prominent leader in any religious movement; for in his earlier years his views appear to have been in a very fluctuating state. When he was seven years old his family removed from Totteridge to Combe Bank, Sundridge, where Christopher Wordsworth the elder had just been appointed rector (1816). Manning became very intimate with the remarkable family of the Wordsworths; but we do not hear anything about church influence except that the good rector's sermons seemed to him rather dull. In 1822 he went to

Harrow, where, he says, "the services in the church for most of the boys were worse than useless",[1] and where the religious instruction consisted in "reading on Sundays *Waller's Catechism*, and *Paley's Evidences*, or *Lesley* [sic] *on Deism*",—excellent books, no doubt, but hardly calculated to inspire a youth with enthusiasm. In 1827 he proceeded to Balliol College, Oxford, threw himself heartily into the various phases of undergraduate life, and became apparently a sort of Admirable Crichton. He was a good cricketer, an excellent oar, a very brilliant and frequent speaker at "The Union", and distinguished for his social talents. With all these distractions, however, he found time for reading, and by a vigorous effort at the last managed to secure a place in the first class in Classical Honours in 1830. Charles Wordsworth, the friend of his boyhood, who was his private tutor, tells us that "on leaving Oxford Manning's religious opinions were quite unformed"; and we can easily believe it, for the religious influences which were brought to bear upon him were of a strangely varied character. First, there was the influence of his brother-in-law, J. D. Anderdon, who was sixteen years his senior, and was partner with his father in the firm of "Manning and Anderdon". Mr. Anderdon was the anonymous author of *A Layman's Life of Bishop Ken*, and his influence would, of course, be in a strongly church direction.

[1] Quoted in Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, i. 18.

He persuaded Manning to read, in the later part of his undergraduate career, the great English divines of the seventeenth century; and in other ways affected him really if not deeply. "During my time at Oxford", Manning writes, "a religious change had come over me; the daily chapel became very soothing, especially the Psalms and Lessons; I studied for the first time the Old and New Testaments; I read *Barrow's Sermons* with great care, then *Butler's Analogy* and *Sermons* with still greater." But he gives 1830 as the date of his conversion, and the human instruments of it two pious Evangelicals, Mr. Bevan and his sister Mrs. Mortimer, afterwards a most successful educational writer.[1] He also became intimate with some Quakers, who lent him Puritan books, such as Owen and Howe. Now came the question of a profession. "I had never", he writes, "given a thought to Orders or Apostolical Succession, and had but a vague conception of the church; but I had always believed in Baptismal Regeneration." In 1831 he first spoke to Anderdon about taking Holy Orders; against which he had, by his own account, a strong prejudice to overcome. "The thought of being a clergyman was positively repulsive to me. I had an intense recoil from the secularity of the Established Church. I can say before God that I had not a spark of

[1] Perhaps no little books were at one time more used to give the earliest religious and secular instruction than her *Peep of Day, Line upon Line, More about Jesus, Precept upon Precept, Near Home, Far Off,* and *Reading without Tears.*

ecclesiastical ambition. The sight of an apron and of a shovel hat literally provoked me. The title 'Father in God' applied to Bishops living at ease irritated me." "I had a drawing to Christian piety, but a revulsion from the Anglican Church. I thought it secular, pedantic, and unspiritual."

He had been intended by his father for a clergyman, but had begged off, and had obtained a situation as supernumerary clerk in the Colonial Office; his ambition was to distinguish himself in parliamentary life; but at last, through the advice of Mrs. Mortimer, he decided to take orders. In April, 1832, he was elected Fellow of Merton College, and in 1833 was ordained, and became assistant curate to the Rev. John Sargent, rector of Wool Lavington and Graffham. Mr. Sargent was a noted Evangelical, and the biographer of one of the greatest saints in the Evangelical calendar (Henry Martyn); and all the influences brought to bear on Manning at this time were of an Evangelical cast. He became acquainted with the Rev. Henry Blunt of Chelsea, an excellent specimen of the Evangelical school, who gave him a higher ideal of the clerical calling. Mr. Sargent had four beautiful daughters, one of whom was married to Samuel Wilberforce. Manning became engaged to another sister, Caroline, and married her in 1833, succeeding Mr. Sargent, who died in the same year, as rector of Lavington and Graffham. He was an excellent parish priest, but it is exceedingly difficult to tabu-

late with any sort of accuracy his relationship to the existing parties in the church. In 1835 we find him preaching, at the Archdeacon's visitation, in Chichester Cathedral in favour of the Apostolical Succession. But within a few months he is at a meeting of the S. P. C. K. in London, "to defend", he says, "the Evangelical cause against the archbishop" (Dr. Howley). In 1838 he seems thoroughly to identify himself with the Oxford movement in a sermon on "The Rule of Faith", preached at Bishop Otter's primary visitation. In publishing this sermon he added an appendix in which he expressed the same views yet more strongly. This sermon appears to have broken his connection with the Low Church clergy of the diocese, who were highly offended at it, and to have thrown him for a time into the arms of the Oxford men. He sent a copy of the sermon to Newman and Keble, and was invited by Newman to write for *The British Critic*; which he did. He also wrote against the Ecclesiastical Commission as an encroachment upon the liberty of the church—a grievance, indeed, which was felt by others besides the Oxford men, though it was particularly offensive to the latter. But in 1840 he became Archdeacon of Chichester, and his charges in that capacity were increasingly anti-Tractarian. It seems to me, however, a gratuitous assumption on the part of his biographer that the change was due to an unwillingness to be on the unpopular side; it is more charitable

and, as I think, more reasonable to believe that it was due to the changed aspect of the movement after the publication of Tract 90; many besides Manning took a different view after that event. At any rate, as a matter of fact, Manning took the side of Newman's enemies on that memorable occasion in 1841; and in 1842 he repudiated in his charge all connection with any party in the church. In his charge of 1843 he disclaimed, still more emphatically and pointedly, any connection with Pusey or Newman; and finally, in his charge of 1845 he attacked the Church of Rome and the Romanizing party in the Church of England so fiercely as to call forth a remonstrance from Dr. Pusey.

Then came another change, due probably to his reading Newman's *Essay on the Development of Doctrine*, which produced a great effect upon his mind. From 1846 onwards his letters to Robert Wilberforce show that he was less and less convinced of the validity of the claims of the English Church. The same tone runs through his letters to Dr. Pusey, to whom, *e.g.*, he wrote in 1847, sympathizing with him in his trouble at Leeds, and adding: "The direct and certain tendency of what remains of the original movement is to the Roman Church". The Gorham judgment broke the tie, which had been growing weaker and weaker for more than four years, that bound him to the English Church, and on April 6, 1851, he was received into

the Church of Rome. His opinions had always been, more or less, in an unsettled state. "I was a Pietist", he said in after years, "until I accepted the Tridentine Decrees"; and again, "I had never been one of the company of men working in Oxford. I knew them all. I agreed in most things, not from contact with them, but because at Lavington I read by myself in the same direction."

But if all this be so—and it rests, as will have been perceived, upon actual facts, and upon Manning's own words, not upon any one's opinion about him—can it be correct to represent Manning as in any way a leader of the Anglican movement? His heart never was wholly in it, and on occasions was decidedly against it.

Among others who went over to Rome at or about the same time were Mr. Maskell, Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Henry Wilberforce, Mr. Allies, Mr. Hope Scott, Mr. Badeley, and Archdeacon Wilberforce.

These were all men of mark in their way. Mr. William Maskell had done valuable service to the church as an ecclesiastical antiquary, especially by his researches into the ancient liturgies of the church, and by his *History of the Martin Marprelate controversy in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.* He was chaplain to the Bp. of Exeter (Phillpotts), and had conducted the examination of Mr. Gorham. Mr. William Dodsworth was a Cambridge man, and had come over from the Evangelicals to the Tractarians. He was a popular preacher and a

very estimable clergyman in London, where he became intimately associated with Dr. Pusey, who established an Anglican Sisterhood in his parish (Christ Church, S. Pancras), and placed it under his direction. In consequence of the Gorham judgment he joined the Roman Church in January, 1851. Mr. Henry Wilberforce was the younger brother of Samuel Wilberforce. He was a double first-classman, and had been for some time vicar of East Farleigh near Maidstone. He had been a great friend of Newman and all the leaders, and was a man of a genial and original character. Mr. T. W. Allies was an Oxford first-classman and university prizeman. He was incumbent of the historical village of Launton, in the diocese of Oxford, where he was brought into collision with his diocesan (Bp. Wilberforce) in consequence of a *Journal in France* which he published, and which was of a distinctly Roman tendency. It does not appear that he was driven to Rome by the Gorham judgment. Indeed, he went over a little before the final judgment in that case was given, resigning his living on Sept. 3, 1849, and being admitted into the Roman Church shortly afterwards; but he belongs to the same group of seceders. Mr. J. R. Hope Scott (he added the name of Scott in later life) was an Oxford friend of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Selborne, Manning, and Newman, and was the confidential adviser of the last-named in after years. He was a Fellow of Merton, and became a famous

parliamentary barrister. There is an adventitious interest about him, as having become, through his wife, the possessor of Abbotsford. He was received into the Roman Church at the same time as his friend Manning, April 6, 1851. Mr. E. L. Badeley was his intimate friend, and was also an ecclesiastical lawyer of note, whose legal services were frequently engaged by the church party; indeed it was he who had argued the Bishop of Exeter's case against Mr. Gorham before the Judicial Committee. He and Manning were among fourteen members of the meeting who, in the summer of 1850, signed nine resolutions, the gist of which was that the views of the Privy Council on Baptism should be solemnly disavowed by the English Church; and when no such action was taken, he went over to Rome.

The last secession to be noted was perhaps the most grievous of all. Of the four celebrated brothers Wilberforce, none was so learned, so saintly, so eminently lovable in every respect as Robert Isaac. He was a double first-classman, a Fellow and most able and effective Tutor of Oriel, an excellent parish priest, and a powerful and attractive writer. Among the correspondents of the great bishop there is not one to whom his whole heart was so evidently given as his brother Robert Isaac. Like many very learned men he was diffident of himself, but he was candid and open as the daylight; he was indeed an honour to any religious communion to which he belonged; and he all but

died as he had lived in the church of his baptism. But the Hampden and the Gorham cases shook him; and he finally succumbed to the incessant arguments and importunities of his brother Henry and his connection, Manning—though he was quite the equal of both in point of real learning and abilities—and joined the Church of Rome in 1854, dying a few weeks afterwards.

It cannot be denied that these, to which others might be added, were serious secessions—perhaps even more serious than those which had taken place in 1845-6, excepting of course the great secession of all. But the party was far better able to bear them; for in spite of appearances to the contrary, it was in reality stronger in 1851 than it had been in 1846; and when we compare the handful that were taken away with the vast numbers who remained, the loss will appear a trifling one.

Immediate steps were taken (1) to vindicate the church from complicity in the Gorham judgment, and (2) to encourage friends and prevent them from seceding to Rome. Church unions were formed in all parts of the country, and monster meetings were held in London, at one of which, held in the Freemasons' Hall in July, 1850, both Keble and Pusey uttered some weighty words. Keble, sounding his characteristic note of "patience", made a telling point by reminding the meeting that "the early church had been content to wait fifty-six years"—that is, from the Council of Nice in 325 A.D. to the Coun-

cil of Constantinople in 381—"for rest from troubles on a chief point of doctrine", while "we", he adds, "are now in 1850, and some eager ones think it much too long to wait for 1851 or 1852 for settlement of our present trouble". Then rising to an unwonted strain of eloquence, "The whole air", he said, "of England seems to me to ring with voices from the dead and from the living, especially from the holy dead, all to this effect: 'Stay here; think not of departing; do here your work'". Pusey recommended a bold front: "We stand where two roads part—the way of the world and the way of the church; the way of man and the way of God. . . If the state will not, as Magna Charta pledges it, allow that the church should have her liberties inviolate, we must ask that the state will set us free from itself, and go forth, as Abraham, not knowing whither he went, poor as to this world's goods, but rich with the blessing of that seed in whom all nations of the earth shall be blessed." At the same time he was far too well-read a man to agree with the extravagant theories which, in the recoil from the judgment of a lay court, some put forth on the church's entire independence of the state. To correct these he published his valuable fragment on *The Royal Supremacy* (1850), in which he showed that the early church did *not* deny to the state all control over church matters, due safeguards being provided. R. W. Church also wrote a valuable article in *The Christian Remembrancer* on the same

subject. At another meeting of the London Church Union at St. Martin's Hall, October, 1850, Pusey, referring, as he rarely did, to the now reiterated charge of Romanizing brought against himself and his friends, said: "If the labours of 17 or 27 years will not persuade men that we are faithful to the Church of England, words will not. We must await God's time, until this fever of fear subside; or if nothing will convince them, death in the bosom of the church will." Experience proved the truth of this utterance; after the secession of Robert Wilberforce, it is astonishing how few men of mark dreamed of leaving the Church of England for Rome.

Meanwhile the Roman Church itself was not idle. It was quite in accordance with the papal policy in relation to the English Church from the earliest times, that Pope Pius IX. should choose this time of perplexity as a favourable time for pushing his claims. In the autumn of 1850 England was parcelled out into dioceses, and the bishops dignified with territorial titles, all under the direction of the astute Dr. Wiseman, who was now raised to the cardinalate, and exchanged the shadowy title of Bishop of Melipotamos *in partibus* for the more definite and impressive one of Archbishop of Westminster. It is said that the bull for creating this new Archbishopric of Westminster had been prepared for three years. Possibly the troubles at Rome and the exile of the pope at Gaëta may have

delayed its publication. At any rate October, 1850, was a convenient season for launching it. It was just the time when the Gorham case had made some people doubt whether the Church of England, steeped, as they deemed it, in Erastianism, was a safe home for them to dwell in; while others were filled with the utmost alarm by the secessions to Rome which it had provoked, and was still provoking. The "Papal Aggression", as it was termed, fanned the alarm into a furious flame. Lord John Russell, the premier, encouraged by his recent triumph over the High Churchmen in the Hampden case, rushed, nothing loath, into the arena; wrote a violent letter to the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Maltby), garnished with copious references to "the unworthy sons of the church", "the mummeries of superstition", and so forth; and succeeded in getting a bill passed through Parliament in February, 1851, declaring the assumption of ecclesiastical titles in England by Roman Catholic priests illegal. The Roman Catholics quietly disregarded the law, and went on calling themselves by their new titles, and the act became a dead letter. The panic passed away, and the movement in the English Church advanced, still vehemently opposed, but falsifying the predictions of its many opponents that its ultimate goal was Rome.

Chapter IX.

The Movement and Public Worship.

Little or nothing has been said in the preceding chapters about that which, to the outer eye, is the most distinctive feature of the Anglican Movement —the wonderful change which it has wrought in the conduct of public worship, and in the fabrics in which that worship is conducted. The reason is, that this feature did not come prominently forward in the earlier stages of the movement. At the same time it is a mistake to suppose that its first leaders attached no importance to externals. No one can read *The Christian Year*, still less *The Lyra Innocentium*, without perceiving that the value of the outward, not only as expressive of, but as deeply affecting the inward, was keenly felt by John Keble; as indeed he showed in a practical form by devoting all the profits of *The Christian Year* to the restoration of Hursley Church. Dr. Pusey expressly said in after years that "they [the first leaders] were very anxious about ritual, but that the circumstances were entirely different then from what they are now (1866). They shrank from caring for externals at the outset of their work, from introducing ritual before doctrine had taken possession of the hearts of their people. It was like giving children flowers that would fade, wither, and die immediately. They had laboured rather to plant

the bulbs, which in good time would send forth their flowers, flourishing abundantly."[1] These words are all the more significant because Dr. Pusey was very far from identifying himself with the "ritualists"; and, in fact, on more than one occasion expressed disapproval of them.[2] Newman, indeed, is noted for having perpetrated one of the most hideous ecclesiastical edifices in England; but that was in his pre-Anglican days. When he walked—for a time—in the Via Media, he fully recognized the importance of ritual, showing this in a practical way in connection with his new church at Littlemore. It is curious to observe the mixed feeling of admiration, surprise, and a little alarm, with which his closest friend describes the church as it appeared on the day of consecration. "Newman's church," writes Lord Blachford to his sister, Sept. 4, 1836, "now finished, is certainly one of the most perfect things for its size I ever saw. The altar is beautiful, and the rest is so well kept under, that when you come in you seem to see nothing but the altar; never, certainly, was anything so unlike modern churches. The builders, &c., are extremely puzzled at the capricious and unseemly (as to them appears) way in which his ornament is spent: no cushions in the arm-chairs by the side of the altar, mere rush hassocks for the

[1] Dr. Pusey's speech at the annual meeting of the English Church Union in 1866, quoted by Mr. Hore in *The Church in England from William III. to Victoria*, ii. 323.

[2] See *Life of Pusey*, vol. iv. pp. 211–2, 271–2, 277.

priest to kneel on there; no cushion to support the prayer-book on the altar; no cushions or *hangings* on the pulpit *at all*; and instead of a reading-desk, the kind of stand that a person plays the violin before, with a bran hassock to kneel on when necessary; while the altar itself was carved stone, with seven pretty Early English arches behind it." He adds that they were all afraid what the Bishop [Bagot], who came to consecrate it, would say, but that he was very kind and complimentary.[1] It was the same with Isaac Williams, who published, in the early part of 1838, *The Cathedral, or The Catholick and Apostolick Church in England.* This poem was written about the same time as his first Tract on *Reserve*, and "in pursuance of the same great object we had undertaken" [in the Tracts]; and his mode of aiding that object was by connecting each part of the edifice with some portion of church doctrine or discipline. And in his subsequent volume, *The Baptistery* (1842), the leading idea is that earthly things were a shadow of heavenly.

Indeed, the fact that one of the chief features of the movement was the greater prominence it gave to the objective side of religion, as a complement to the subjectivity of Evangelicalism, is of itself enough to show that it could never have regarded the externals of worship as a matter of slight moment. It was of its essence to teach the dignity

[1] *Letters of Lord Blachford*, p. 38.

and importance of the sacraments; and a necessary corollary to such teaching was that the adjuncts of worship were of real account. Accordingly, we find that as soon as these principles began to take root and to spread in all directions, attention was at once paid to the subject.

In 1838 the Oxford Architectural Society was founded, with Mr. J. H. Parker, an enthusiast on the subject of Gothic architecture, for its first secretary. In 1839 the Cambridge Camden Society arose, Mr. Benjamin Webb, Mr. E. J. Boyce, and Mr. J. M. Neale being its chief founders. The object of the society, which in 1846 was removed to London, and changed its name to "The Ecclesiological Society", was "the promotion of the study of Christian Art and Antiquities, more especially in whatever relates to the architecture, arrangement, and decoration of churches". Nothing blocked the way towards the attainment of this object more effectually than the pew system, which was then almost universal. Accordingly, the society waged internecine war against this system, chiefly through its organ, *The Ecclesiologist*. Mr. Neale wrote *A History of Pews, A Few Words to Church Builders, A Few Words to Churchwardens on Churches and Church Ornaments*; and the advocacy of open seats in church became part of the work of the movement. The example of Oxford and Cambridge was followed in other districts, and "Architectural" or "Archæological" Societies were established with,

more or less, the same object. The crusade against pews met with great opposition, being termed "The Tractarian Anti-Pew Mania"; but it is needless to say that it was in the end successful. So also were the efforts to present more fully the church's system, with its daily round from Advent to Advent; to restore and beautify the church fabrics, and generally to make public worship externally more worthy of its high purpose. So also were the efforts to improve our psalmody, which had long been one of the weakest points in our public services. In 1841 the Motett Society was founded for the purpose of reviving "the study and practice of the choral service of the Church".[1] Men like Sir F. A. G. Ouseley (who was for some time curate at one of the most advanced churches, S. Barnabas, Pimlico) and Dr. W. H. Monk (who was organist at another, S. Matthias, Stoke-Newington) did a world of good in this direction. The Ecclesiological Society also took up the matter warmly.

How sorely needed such efforts were is testified by one of the few survivors who still remember what public worship was before the revival. "It must be admitted", writes Mr. Gladstone, "that the state of things from which the thing popularly known as Ritualism took historically its point of departure, was dishonouring to Christianity, disgraceful to the nation, disgraceful most of all to that much-vaunted

[1] See Mr. Hore's *The Church in England from William III. to Victoria*, ii. 324.

religious sentiment of the English public which in impenetrable somnolence endured it, and resented all interference with it. . . . The actual state of things was bad beyond all parallel known to me in experience or reading. Taking together the expulsion of the poor and labouring classes (especially from the town churches), the mutilations and blockages of the fabrics, the baldness of the service, the elaborate horrors of the so-called music, with the jargon of parts contrived to exhibit the powers of every village roarer, and to prevent all congregational singing; and, above all, the coldness and indifference of the lounging or sleeping congregations, our services were probably without a parallel in the world for their debasement."[1]

This general testimony is borne out in detail by another distinguished layman, a disciple of the Oxford school,[2] who himself took no small part in bringing about a change for the better in church worship and church fabrics. "In the reign of George IV.", writes Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope, "worship in the Church of England in an opulent and beautiful town in Surrey"—that is, of course, Dorking—"was made palpable to my childish senses. The building was a large, and had been a

[1] "Ritualism and Ritual", published first in *The Contemporary Review* for October, 1874, and afterwards republished in the *Gleanings*.

[2] This is Mr. Hope's own description of himself though he was a Cambridge man: "For the formation of my views upon Christian antiquity and upon the Church of England I am mainly indebted to that school of writers whose public notoriety dates from the commencement of the Tracts for the Times in 1833."—*Worship in the Church of England*, ch. i., p. 4.

handsome Gothic church, but of its interior the general parish saw very little except the nave and aisles, for the chancel was cut off by a perfectly solid partition, covered with the usual sacred writings and some strange painting, among which Moses and Aaron shone in peculiar uncouthness. The aisles were utilized for certain family pews or private boxes, raised aloft and approached by private doors and staircases. There was a decrepit western gallery for the band, and the ground floor was crammed with cranky pews of every shape." After having spoken of the "communion office being read at the desk" and other strange uses, he adds, "It was not so very backward a parish; it possessed one of the earliest national schools".[1]

In a letter to the present writer, dated November, 1886, the same gentleman dwells upon the reform in the matter of public worship in a very important sphere, that of one of our largest public schools, commenced fifty years before by one who has been already noticed as a weighty factor in the Anglican Revival, though not, strictly speaking, a Tractarian. "Among the benefits", he writes, "bestowed by Dr. Wordsworth on the school [Harrow], foremost comes the building of the school chapel; with this work old order ceased, and Harrow school took its place in the general revival of church interests. Words cannot describe the dreariness of the worship offered to us in my days. One rustic, battered

[1] *Worship in the Church of England*, i. 8.

gallery filled up the west end of the nave of Harrow Parish Church, and served for the Upper boys; another stifling and cavernous gallery was hitched into the north aisle for the Lower boys. The worship took no account of the needs and peculiarities of school-boys, but was merely the parish worship, of which they were casual spectators. . . . With a school chapel built by Dr. Wordsworth, all was changed. The original building, due to Mr. Cockerell, had not much to say for itself architecturally, but the spirit of the thing was there—it was the place of worship of the school, and meant for the wants of the school; bit by bit it has been replaced by the present beautiful chapel, but as the dawn of good things, Dr. Wordsworth's chapel should be held in everlasting remembrance."[1]

These are reminiscences of men who had lived on to see better things. But the contemporary evidence of the low estate to which the externals of worship had fallen is, in one sense, more valuable, because the writers would hardly have had the audacity to give it, if anyone who had eyes and ears could have contradicted it if it had been false; for it was not a matter of opinion but of seeing and hearing. A few extracts, therefore, from the wealth of evidence which is available, may be given.

What, then, do contemporaries tell us about the state of our country churches before the revival? "Let any one", says a writer in the *British Critic*,

[1] Quoted in *Life of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth*, ch. iv.

in 1827, "make a circuit of the villages throughout a considerable portion of these realms, and what is the spectacle which in too many instances will salute his eyes on entering the church-yard? On looking at the exterior of the church, he will often find it half buried beneath the mould, which has been suffered to accumulate round it for ages, and to spread a gradual decay throughout the walls and foundations. On entering it, he will find that everything answers faithfully to the promise without; and that the external provision for perpetuating dampness and discomfort within has succeeded to admiration. The walls will appear decorated with hangings of green; a carpeting of the same pattern often partially covers the floor; and the very first and last thoughts which are excited by the whole appearance of the building are those of ague, catarrh, and rheumatism." Thirteen years later (1841), a writer in *The Christian Remembrancer* declares that "the traveller through these islands, whose lot it was to have before his eyes the evidence of the gradual substitution of Christianity in the place of Druidical superstition, or Roman, Saxon, or Danish idolatry, could hardly, perhaps, have found among the decaying fanes of Jupiter or Woden, scenes of more dismal ruin and dank desolation than are to be seen at the present moment in some of the houses of God in our rural districts; and the reason why so little is said about it seems to be that we are so accustomed to see our churches generally in a

dilapidated condition, that we have altogether ceased to find anything remarkable in it". And then he gives painful details. It may be objected that writers in *The British Critic* and *The Christian Remembrancer* are prejudiced witnesses, as belonging to the party which set itself to correct the abuses they complained of; but would they have dared to make such assertions if they could have been proved false by anyone who chose to use his eyesight?

The worship within was too often of a piece with the external surroundings. Let us take, as an example, the psalmody. Too often an ill-educated parish clerk was left to make his own selection out of the meagre stores of Tate and Brady. The Evangelicals, indeed, had introduced hymns, and in this, as in other respects, the worship in Evangelical churches was generally in advance of all except those which belonged to "the Clapton", as distinguished from "the Clapham sect". But, as a rule, hymns were regarded as Methodistical, and church people preferred psalms out of which the poetry had been carefully extracted by the compilers of the Old Version or the New. The music was of a piece with the words. According to the same writer in the *British Critic* already quoted, even "some of the London churches, with all the facilities for excellent psalmody, contrived to convert this joyous spiritual exercise into a positive infliction". In the country (with honourable ex-

ceptions) it was either a worse infliction, or ignored altogether. One can hardly imagine an archdeacon, in his charge, making a false assertion on a plain matter of fact; and this is what Archdeacon Bailey says to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Stow in 1826: "Sacred music is an essential part of the Liturgy; it is the very life and soul of every new method of Dissenting worship. Why, then, is it *so rarely invited* to impart a solemn interest to our parochial services?"—with much more to the same effect. So too a clergyman writes in the *British Magazine* in 1832: "I believe it to be a matter of regret general among my clerical brethren, that while almost every Dissenting congregation cultivates sacred music as a part of their public worship, it is altogether neglected in so many of our country churches". Perhaps it was better that it *should* be altogether neglected than that it should be treated, as we learn from no less an authority than Bishop Mant that it *was* treated by some. In his notes "on Psalmody" in his annotated edition of the Book of Common Prayer, published in 1824, he finds it necessary to give this gentle admonition: "If we will not employ our lips in the service, we may still fix our minds upon it; at least, we should not hinder others from doing either. And particularly, we should abstain from giving the bad example and the offence of indecently holding conversation at that time, for which there cannot surely be so pressing an occasion but that it may be very safely

deferred till after church, if not altogether omitted." Then he suggests,—but evidently as a counsel of perfection, which he did not expect to be generally carried out,—that it would be well to stand up during the singing of the Psalms. "Were it more uncommon than it is, it would be far from a dishonourable singularity. But still, as very many in most congregations have by long habit been prejudiced in favour of sitting; or, though they disapprove the custom, feel a difficulty of quitting it unless everyone did, they should not be censured for a practice by which they mean nothing amiss, but kindly encouraged to an alteration in this point, which we may thus hope will gradually become general." It would be easy, but needless, to adduce other instances of the laxity into which the church had fallen in regard to her fabrics and the worship within them; and few, I presume, would deny that the marvellous improvement which has taken place is due mainly to the movement which commenced in 1833.

While this care for public worship derived its impulse from the movement, it also reacted upon that movement itself, and greatly conduced to its strength and extension. The fashion of restoring and beautifying churches was taken up by churchmen of all schools, and had a natural tendency to draw men upward, so to speak. It would be interesting to trace out the numerous instances in which the restored church has helped to change a more or

less Low Church congregation into a more or less High one. People cannot help being affected by their outward surroundings; and when they worshipped in a building, every arrangement of which would be suggestive of a certain system, they were apt, by little and little, and often quite unconsciously, to advance in the direction of that system. It is perfectly marvellous to observe how things are now accepted which once provoked suspicion and even actual rebellion. It is difficult in the present day to realize that fifty years ago the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit was so exasperating a proceeding as to raise serious riots; it is still more difficult to realize that one of the best of our bishops (Dr. Blomfield), whose very natural injunctions to his clergy to obey the rubric led them to don—or rather, not to put off—the obnoxious garment, should have been so alarmed at the opposition as to retract his previous orders; that his successor should have been so annoyed at the sight of coloured stoles as to utter his memorable command, "Take away those ribands"; that another bishop should have inhibited an earnest and devoted clergyman from officiating in his diocese, because he put into his church ornaments, most of which are now really the rule rather than the exception, but which the bishop termed "frippery" and "spiritual haberdashery";[1] that an intelligent layman should have complained to the bishop of the diocese about "rib-

[1] See *Memoir of John Mason Neale* (Littledale).

bons in service-books with small cardboard crosses", and "wreaths on a chancel arch and round church columns";[1] that the introduction of a choral service at St. George's-in-the-East should have raised a mob. But all these things really happened, and, with the exception of the last, arose from truly conscientious feelings. This, however, can scarcely be said of the disgraceful riots at St. George's-in-the-East in 1859. Mr. Bryan King, the vicar, had been working there for eight years, most earnestly, though not perhaps always most judiciously; and with the invaluable aid of two mission priests, Mr. C. F. Lowder and Mr. A. H. Mackonochie, had gradually elevated the tone of his poor parishioners. This, of course, had injured the profits of those who pandered to their vices, and stirred up animosity. Right-minded men could never sympathize with opposition based on such grounds, and, as a matter of fact, men who had no sympathy whatever with the views of the workers, men like Dean Stanley and Judge Hughes, came to the rescue. But this is anticipating. We must go back twenty years.

One of the first definite attempts to apply the principles of the church movement to the accessories of public worship was made by Mr. F. Oakeley in what was then called Margaret Chapel, on the site of which the beautiful church of All Saints', Margaret Street, was afterwards built at the sole expense of Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope. In the summer of

[1] See *Life of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce* (Ashwell), i. 433.

1839 Mr. Oakeley accepted the incumbency of this chapel, "desiring an opportunity of trying the effect of Tractarian principles upon a practical scale".[1] Margaret Chapel seemed a most unpromising sphere for the experiment, for it was "a paragon of ugliness". But perhaps he was helped by the fact that a sense of reverence was traditional there. Here again the testimony of Mr. Gladstone comes in. "Reverence", he writes in 1874, "need not be the property or characteristic of any school in particular. It distinguished the Margaret Chapel of forty years ago, when the pastors of that church were termed Evangelical. It subsisted in that same chapel thirty years ago, when Mr. Oakeley (now, alas! ours no more) and Mr. Upton Richards gave to its very simple services, which would now scarcely satisfy an average congregation, and when the fabric was little less than hideous, that true solemnity which is in perfect concord with simplicity. The Papal Church now enjoys the advantages of the labours of Mr. Oakeley; who united to a fine musical taste a much finer and much rarer gift, in discerning and expressing the harmony between the inward purposes of Christian worship and its outward investiture, and who then had gathered round him a congregation the most devout and hearty that I (for one) have ever seen in any communion of the Christian world."[2]

[1] *Historical Notes of the Tractarian Movement*, by F. Oakeley, p. 61.
[2] *Ritualists and Ritual.*

We have here a remarkable illustration of what has been said above about the general raising of the tone of congregations.[1] Mr. Gladstone tells us that "the simple services" at Margaret Chapel under Mr. Oakeley "would now scarcely satisfy an average congregation", and yet it is clear that Mr. Oakeley found considerable difficulty in establishing even these simple services. There was a recalcitrant old parish clerk who could not be got rid of. The introduction of alms-bags was regarded as "a perilous novelty". They might have, Mr. Oakeley tells us, candles provided they did not light them. They were restricted to one bouquet of flowers on the communion-table, and were required to take especial care that white did not predominate on the feast of a virgin, nor red on that of a martyr. They might preach in a surplice in the morning if they would wear a black gown in the evening,—and so forth.[2] It did not, of course, help the work that Mr. Oakeley followed his friend Newman to Rome, but his colleague Mr. W. Upton Richards remained to the end of his life a loyal son of the Church of England, and became the much-esteemed vicar of Margaret Chapel's glorious successor.

The doings, however, at Margaret Chapel did not create any great sensation; at any rate, not nearly so great as that which arose about 1850 in connection

[1] See *supra*, p. 199.

[2] See Oakeley's *Historical Notes of the Tractarian Movement*, pp. 63 and 69.

with the church of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and its daughter church, S. Barnabas', Pimlico. The incumbent, the Rev. J. W. E. Bennett, was an exceedingly able and energetic man, who, so far from having any tendency to Rome, wrote some *Lectures on the Distinctive Errors of Romanism*, which constitute one of the ablest defences of the Anglican, in contrast with the Roman position, which has ever been published. It was on S. Barnabas' Day, 1850, that Bishop Blomfield consecrated the Church of S. Barnabas with what was for those days a high ceremonial. All passed off well on the day, but when the services were continued on the same lines they were interrupted by the hootings of the mob. Mr. Bennett had promised the bishop that he would resign the living, if it should be thought to be for the good of the church. The bishop now claimed the fulfilment of his promise, and Mr. Bennett retired to Frome, where he lived and worked for many years, making his parish a centre of the Anglican movement. But the services both at S. Paul's and S. Barnabas' were conducted on precisely the same lines under his successor, Mr. Liddell. And this led to the first of those unhappy Ritual trials which so long disturbed the peace of the church.

Into the details of these cases it is not purposed here to enter. It is a subject which should be treated thoroughly or not at all; and though I cannot at all agree with the theory that the Tractarian movement was one thing, the Ritualistic movement

another, still the latter was a new phase which really requires separate treatment, or, at any rate, longer treatment than the space of this little volume will allow. Neither do the limits of the work permit the mention of other churches which were in the van of the movement for raising the ideal of public worship, such as the splendid new parish church at Leeds, built under Dr. Hook, and opened in 1841, where the beauty of the singing soon became a proverb; or the church of S. Thomas', Oxford, or of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, or of S. Alban's, Holborn, or of S. Andrew's, Well Street, or of All Saints', Margaret Street, or of Wantage, under Mr. (afterwards Dean) Butler, or of S. Paul's, Brighton, and the other "Wagner" churches there; or the costly church at Wilton, built by the first Lord Herbert of Lea, or of Highnam, built by Mr. Gambier Parry, or (to end with the most important of all) S. Paul's Cathedral, which has been transmuted from a scandal into a glory of the metropolis. But before concluding, some words must be added about the subject generally.

It was a most unfortunate coincidence that in the very same year in which a movement was started, having for one of its main objects the exaltation of the church as an independent, spiritual society, a change was made in the ultimate court of appeal in matters of doctrine and ritual, which caused many churchmen to feel that the church was regarded as a mere appanage of the state.

After the break with Rome in 1534, the ultimate appeal was to the sovereign. This was no new doctrine; it was simply the reassertion of the old doctrine of the royal supremacy. But there was always a sort of tacit understanding that the sovereign should refer spiritual cases to spiritual persons. And as a matter of fact the sovereign *did* give his or her decision through a court which might, and generally did, to a great extent, consist of spiritual persons—the Court of Delegates. But in 1832 the final appeal was transferred, simply by Act of Parliament (for Convocation then existed only in name, and therefore could not be consulted), from the Court of Delegates to the Privy Council—that is, from the king in Chancery to the king in Council; and then in 1833, to a section of the Privy Council, called the Judicial Committee. This was done by a kind of accident, it being never intended that such ecclesiastical cases should come before the court as did come before it. In fact it was a purely secular court, founded by a purely secular authority. Prelates, indeed, might attend in certain cases, but only as assessors, not as members. "The attendant bishops", said Canon Liddon, "only decorated by their presence a tribunal which was essentially civil and lay; they lent to its decisions a semblance of ecclesiastical authority, which it could not in fact possess, and which was only calculated to embarrass tender consciences."

The case is here put as it appeared to a large

and increasing number of churchmen, from the time of the Gorham judgment pronounced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, onwards. And when these churchmen were charged with being law-breakers, because they rebelled against law so made, they replied in effect, "What do you mean by law? The early Christians were law-breakers when they refused to sprinkle a little incense on the altars of the heathen gods. It might seem a mere trifle; it might mean nothing to *them*; it need not in the least have interfered with their internal faith in the one true God. But a principle was involved; therefore they chose rather to go to the stake than to comply with this simple ceremony. And a principle is involved in our case; we are required to render unto Cæsar the things that are God's."

But if the clergy could not submit to the ruling of a secular court, might they not, at any rate, have submitted to the ruling of the bishops, their own spiritual fathers in God? Undoubtedly they might, and some who refused to submit to the one, did submit to the other. But they also felt that they had a right to ask a reason for the ruling. The bishops were their spiritual *fathers*; but it is the part of a father to guide and direct, not arbitrarily to command, a grown-up, intelligent son. The bishop, they thought, ought to have the law of the church, as well as the law of the state, at his back; and this is exactly what they believed that he had

not. Moreover, it could never be forgotten that, if churchmen had been simply content to follow the lead of individual bishops, there would have been no movement at all. It was just the same with the Church Revival of 1833 as it was with the Evangelical Revival of the preceding century. There was not a single bishop who favoured either revival until it had become a power in the land. It is instructive to turn to the episcopal charges, on the one hand, say, from 1780 to 1800, and on the other hand from 1835 to 1855. It will be found that charge after charge is full of warnings against the revival then in progress, with, at most, a word of faint praise here and there, of the earnest, though misguided, efforts of the workers. Perhaps it is the office of a bishop to guide and regulate, rather than to lead a crusade; but it must be confessed that the leaders of the van of the movement in any of its stages would derive but cold comfort from the study of the episcopal attitude in the past.

All this is apart from the question of ritual itself. That it is exceedingly foolish in any clergyman to start a fancy ritual of his own; that it is worse than foolish to attempt to force any strange ritual upon an unwilling congregation which is not educated up to it;[1] that it is worst of all to make ritual a means of showing and advocating disloyalty to that church

[1] Dr. Pusey thus describes a meeting in 1867: "I had three-fourths or four-fifths of a meeting of the E.C.U. against me on a sentence of mine disclaiming the forcing of ritual on an unwilling congregation,"—and more to the same effect.—*Life*, iv. 216.

to which he is bound by the most solemn obligations; that it argues great weakness in him to be carried away, as it is to be feared some were, beyond his own convictions, by a few irresponsible laymen —all this is most fully admitted. Ritual is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end; and if the end be not an honest one, or if the means be not desirable or judicious, then it is a distinct evil.

Again, a distinction should be drawn between the introduction of a high ritual into a new church or a district church, and into the one old parish church of the place, especially when that church is practically the sole available means of grace for churchmen. The fact must always be reckoned with that there will generally be some, and men who have the root of the matter in them too, who positively dislike an ornate service, quite apart from its supposed approximation to Rome. Even if these form but a small minority their feelings ought to be regarded; and if they form a majority, then the wise clergyman will surely wait until he has succeeded in changing the feeling. It is to be feared that such a course has not always been adopted, and the result has thus been a very distinct weakening of the church.

There is another point which requires handling delicately, but cannot be wholly ignored. The leaders of the early movement were among the most cultured men of the day; and it must be admitted that, with notable exceptions, those who were prominent in the next phase of the movement

were not quite of the same calibre. A keen observer, who had seen both generations, in alluding to a certain ritual dead-lock, writes: "I wish wise men would think it over and give us some guiding principles. At present my prevailing feeling is that this question should not be settled in a passion by a set of second-rate people, who are really fighting the battle of (as it seems to me) their own perversities."[1] The writer of the letter is Frederick Rogers (Lord Blachford); the recipient, Dean Church. How many have we had, of the same calibre, who have been prominent either as ritualists or anti-ritualists? Men on both sides seem to me to have had a tendency to a disease which may be termed "ritual on the brain"—especially when that brain was not a very strong brain.

The real question at issue between the most thoughtful on both sides was not one of ceremonial but of doctrine. Ritual apart from its symbolism is a thing of naught. It was valued by the really earnest men, not for its intrinsic beauty, but for what it taught—taught through the eye rather than through the ear, and therefore, on the Horatian principle, taught more quickly and vividly, and that especially among the poor and the unlearned. If, on the one hand, it was the masses who raised the riots at S. Barnabas', and S. George's-in-the-East, and elsewhere, it was also the masses who were touched by the gorgeous services at S. Alban's, Holborn, S.

[1] *The Letters of Lord Blachford*, p. 375.

Peter's, London Docks, and other similar churches. Can we wonder at it? Think of the sordid surroundings by which they were depressed outside the church, and what an effective means of elevating and impressing them the mere sight of what went on inside the church must have been. Think again what a real refreshment to such labourers in the squalid courts and alleys, as Mr. Lowder and Mr. Mackonochie, must the grandeur of God's House have afforded.

It is one of the happiest features of these closing years of the nineteenth century that there is a better chance than there has been for many a long year of peace within the borders of the sanctuary.

Chapter X.

Causes of the Success of the Movement.

It remains to sum up the chief causes of the rapid spread and enduring success of a movement, which is described by one who had been a keen observer of life for fourscore years as "by far the most remarkable phenomenon he had witnessed throughout his long career"[1]; which, taking its rise in a learned university, soon extended to very different spheres, alike to the country villages, the market-

[1] Thomas Grenville (1755-1846). See Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, "Samuel Wilberforce", ii. 1.

towns, the cathedral cities, and the great manufacturing centres.

(1) The revived study of church history was partly a result, but partly also a very potent cause, of the movement's success. More than half a century has elapsed since H. H. Milman cynically, but with a great amount of truth, declared that those who desired to know the history of the early church must turn to the pages of Gibbon. But such a remark could hardly have been made twenty-five years later. A subject so interesting to all Christians had begun to be more deeply studied in the interval; and the more closely it was studied, the better it was for the Anglican movement, which was essentially a revival of historical Christianity. The study taught men to realize the continuity of the English Church, and scattered to the winds the theory that a new Parliamentary church was invented in the reign of Henry VIII.; it taught them to discriminate between what was merely mediæval and what was primitive; and thus it removed the difficulty, which the popular Evangelicalism hardly did, about justifying our English Reformation; while, on the other hand, instead of helping the cause of Rome, it in reality cut away the ground from under her feet. "They have no support in the Fathers, sir. In the first three centuries not one word."[1] Thus spoke, in his stately way, Dr.

[1] Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, "Martin Joseph Routh, the Learned Divine", vol. i. p. 56.

Routh, by far the most learned English divine of his day, concerning the Roman, so far as they differed from the English, Catholics. Dr. Routh, of course, never threw himself into the movement (he held aloof from all movements); but he saw its strength, and, in spite of his aloofness, gave its leaders a sort of dignified support.

(2) The revived sense of beauty in all departments, which is popularly termed æstheticism, was a valuable ally to the movement. It was, perhaps, fortunate that prominence was not given in the early stage to the adjuncts of worship; otherwise it might have been said that the revival was merely the ecclesiastical form which æstheticism took. But dates show that it was not so. The principles advocated by Keble, Pusey, and Newman, had established themselves before the æsthetic wave passed over the country. We were still in the reign of ugliness; but when that reign passed away, and a sense of the beautiful in architecture, in music, in painting, in the fine arts generally, asserted its sway, it found its natural home, so far as religion was concerned, in the remodelled church. Men who loved beautiful music and grand surroundings in their worship had in former times gone to Roman Catholic chapels in order to find them; now they need not cross the borders of their own church. Rome could no longer claim a monopoly in enlisting what appealed to the sense of beauty into the service of the Almighty.

(3) It may seem to be attributing too much importance to a comparatively trifling matter, but there is no doubt that very great influence in the Anglican direction was exercised by the vast number of tales for the young which followed in the wake of the *Tracts for the Times* in rapid succession. Many who would never have dreamed of reading the Tracts read with avidity the tales of Dr. Neale, Mr. Gresley, Mr. Paget, Miss Sewell, Miss C. M. Yonge, and Mr. J. W. E. Bennett; while the allegories of Samuel Wilberforce, William Adams, and Edward Monro, took the place in many families of *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*. In any revival it is of course of vital importance to win over the rising generation; otherwise the work dies out with the generation that dies away. But it was especially important in this revival, which in the first instance was the reverse of a popular one. The writings of its first leaders, however excellent, were "caviare to the general". Even *The Christian Year* (still more *The Lyra Innocentium*) demanded a much greater effort of the intellect than the majority are willing to give, really to understand it; and to this day I believe it is a book more bought and quoted than generally read. And the tales in question, though adapted and intended for the young, were not at all beneath the notice of grown-up people, who are often children in mind when they are no longer children in years. Indeed, such stories as *The Siege of Lichfield*, *The Heir of Redclyffe*, *Amy Her-*

bert, *Shepperton Manor*, *The Owlet of Owlstone Edge*, and such allegories as *The Rocky Island*, *The Shadow of the Cross*, and *The Dark River*, are literature which the most learned and highly-cultivated adults need not be ashamed of reading and admiring; and a vast number *did* read and admire it, while, half-unconsciously perhaps, they imbibed the principles of the writers.

(4) The personal characters of the leaders were of a kind to commend any cause which they espoused to the respectful consideration of the pious and the thoughtful. John and Thomas Keble, E. B. Pusey, J. H. Newman, R. H. Froude, Isaac Williams, Charles Marriott, and the rest were all men of a very high type, morally, spiritually, and intellectually. No breath of scandal ever sullied the fair fame of any one of them; their earnestness and sincerity were not denied even by those who thought that they spent their lives in propagating the most mischievous and deadly delusions. They were all on the foundations of their respective colleges, and were therefore, in a sense, picked men to begin with; and there they were trained up to the finest possible point, leading one another upwards, as young trees do in a plantation. It is wonderful also what kindliness, forbearance, and consideration they showed one towards another. They were men of very independent minds, and were by no means inclined to follow one after the other, as sheep do when they go through a hedge. But this indepen-

dence does not appear to have in the least interrupted the harmony of their joint work. It was not "a treble cord", but a tenfold or a twenty-fold cord, which, of course, was "not easily broken". The movement was emphatically one which began at the top and worked downwards; not *vice versâ*. And this surely is the right order; for it is far easier and more satisfactory to popularize a system which has an intellectual backbone, than it is to give an intellectual backbone to a system which begins by being popular and invertebrate.

(5) It supplied a want which Evangelicalism supplied in its day, but which it was fast failing to satisfy. The Oxford men and their successors touched life at far more points than the older Evangelicals ever did. To quote the unimpeachable testimony of Principal Tulloch, who, though standing apart from both, might certainly be expected to sympathize far more with Low than with High churchmen: "The Evangelical school, with all its merits, had conceived of Christianity rather as something superadded to the highest life of humanity, than as the perfect development of that life; as a scheme for human salvation authenticated by miracles, and, so to speak, interpolated into human history, rather than a divine philosophy. Philosophy, literature, art, and science were conceived apart from religion. The world and the church were severed portions of life divided by outward signs and badges; and those who joined the one or the other were supposed

to be clearly marked off."[1] It was a mischievous notion to go abroad that piety was alienated from the higher culture; but it certainly *was* a very prevalent notion, though not altogether a just one, at the time when the Oxford movement began. And to this very day, while we can admire the beautiful characters of the early Evangelicals, we cannot read their books. But the Oxford school, unlike the Evangelicals, produced a literature of enduring merit; and, unlike the Broad churchmen and the "establishment men", had a definite system to recommend. For

(6) Another cause of the success of the movement was that it taught men to realize that the church could give them something worth fighting for. "Liberty of thought" on the one hand, and "Our happy establishment in Church and State" on the other, were too vague, too unspiritual things to kindle enthusiasm; but the Holy Catholic Church was not. The Evangelical Revival derived its impetus from its insistence upon the necessity of the conversion of the individual sinner's soul to God; the Anglican Revival, from its insistence upon the supplementary, not contradictory, truth that God's elect "are knit together in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of His Son". The one was the triumph of individualism, the other, of collectivism.

[1] *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the Nineteenth Century*, p. 13.

Practical work

(7) The practical work in the parish, in the diocese, and in the church at large, which arose out of the movement, has been a most potent cause of its success. It would be a cruel injustice to many good men, especially those of the Evangelical school, to claim for the Anglican Revival an exclusive share in the vast increase both in the amount and efficiency of church work which has characterized the nineteenth century as compared with the eighteenth. On the contrary, in many dioceses and parishes that work was in full swing before the movement commenced, and in still more, before it made itself felt. But that is the very reason why its practical work has been one of the chief reasons of its success. It had not to create a sense of the necessity of such work—that was created already; and the very fact that it existed led to the keen appreciation of what the revival did in the domain of practice. It commended itself to men who could not enter into the nice distinctions of theology by the real good its adherents appeared to be doing. And moreover, it gave a certain definiteness and system to the work, which was needed. In such dioceses as Oxford under Bishop Wilberforce, Salisbury under Bishops Denison, Hamilton, and Moberley, Lincoln under Bishop Wordsworth, Lichfield under Bishop Selwyn; in such parishes as Leeds under Dr. Hook, Wantage under Mr. Butler, Kidderminster under Mr. Claughton, Yarmouth under Mr. Hills, Frome under Mr. Bennett, you trace the peculiar stamp of the revival in what

was done. It was done often amidst great opposition, but that very opposition called attention to it, and thus really helped on the success of the movement.

It is wonderful, again, how much of the work of the church at large during the last fifty years is, directly or indirectly, due to the movement we are considering. The restoration, after much discouragement in high places, of the active powers of Convocation, the establishment of the less regular, but not less efficient, Church Congresses and Diocesan Conferences, of Sisterhoods, of Guilds, of parochial missions, of retreats and quiet days; the increase of the episcopate at home and abroad, the revival of the office of (so-called) Suffragan Bishops, and many other organizations, may fairly be said to have originated with men who were, more or less, influenced by the movement; though they were afterwards taken up by others. "Nothing succeeds like success", and the successful carrying out of such projects in detail, materially contributed to the success of the movement as a whole. It is the natural tendency of practical workers to join themselves to that body in which practical work is most efficiently carried out; and it would not be difficult to point out many instances in which men who began by having no sympathy with the theoretical side of the movement have been gradually drawn into it by its success in practical work. This has been more especially the case with Broad Churchmen, who, having never formed one compact body, as the Evan-

gelicals did, have in numberless cases virtually identified themselves with the movement party.

(8) It was a revival of the poetry of religion, which had well-nigh died out at the commencement of the Georgian era; in other words it was, as Dr. Pusey expressed it, "a return to the seventeenth century". A singularly prosaic type of Christianity set in when Tillotson was the most admired of preachers, and Locke the most influential of philosophers. The type was intensified in the days of the "evidence writers", culminating in the Paley school of divinity, which applied the utilitarian theory of Jeremy Bentham to religion. The Evangelicals introduced a far more tender and spiritual element, but even they laid so much stress upon the fear of future punishment and the hope of future reward that they seemed rather to extend the Benthamite principle of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" to another world, which the utilitarians applied to this world. The church was inclined to be prosaic and commonplace from the accession of the first George up to the commencement of the Oxford movement. There were very few whose religion was of that spirit which breathes through every page of our Liturgy, and which produced such men as Lancelot Andrewes, Nicholas Ferrar, George Herbert, Robert Sanderson, Thomas Ken, John Kettlewell, George Bull, Simon Patrick, William Beveridge, and Robert Nelson. Here and there an instance like that of William Law or of William

Jones of Nayland might be found, but these were quite exceptions; the type had practically died out. The difference between the churchmen of the later date and those of the earlier was like the difference between a modern prayer and an ancient one; or between an old Gothic church with all its mellowed beauty and a brand-new town-hall with all its garishness. The latter may be a useful edifice, but there is no poetry about it. The Anglican revival was a return to the old type reflected in the Prayer Book. It caught the imagination, it supplied a refuge for many who revolted from the prosaic spirit of the age.

It is a notable fact that a large proportion of the men who have been prominent in the movement have been, more or less, gifted with the spirit of poetry. It has been seen that three at least of that brilliant galaxy which lighted up the firmament in the early part of the nineteenth century—Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Sir Walter Scott—prepared the way for the movement. And of the few who took a leading part in the movement itself in its early stage, no less than five—J. Keble, J. H. Newman, I. Williams, J. M. Neale, and F. W. Faber—were true poets. Not only did their religion affect their poetry, but also their poetry affected their religion and tended to make it attractive. What was once said in a periodical, which cannot be accused of having too ecclesiastical proclivities,[1] of a later phase of the

[1] *The Pall Mall Gazette.*

movement, is at least as true of the earlier: "It made the Church of England interesting". It has been, and still is, a standing witness and a valuable protest against the utilitarian philosophy and rampant industrialism of the age. The Victorian age has been termed "the age of inventions", and we point with conscious pride to our railways, our telegraphs, our telephones, our machinery, our sanitary arrangements, our manufactures, as proofs of our greatness. But, after all, there is another part of our nature which the utmost perfection of appliances that only touch the material life cannot affect. To this part the movement appealed, and it did not appeal in vain; it is a remarkable fact that no section of society has been more affected by it than that which is incessantly occupied in workshops, manufactories, and such like places. Hence it is that it has been more successful in crowded centres than in country places: in the latter the clergy have generally had to push on the people; in the former the people have very often had to push on the clergy. But both in town and country it has supplied a want which mere materialism can never satisfy; for, as Matthew Arnold says in one of his prose works, the human mind is interested in higher questions than what papier-mâché is, and how buttons are made.

9 To these causes the adherents of the movement would of course add another, which outweighs them all—the blessing of the Almighty upon His own

God's Blessing on our work
The truth is mighty & will
prevail.

work, the carrying out of the principle that the Truth is mighty and *will* prevail. But this is trenching upon a topic which belongs to the theologian, not to the historian. The task of the latter is ended when he has told, as faithfully as may be, the simple story of what friend and foe must own to be one of the most remarkable and influential movements of modern times.

Index.

Adams, Rev. W., 214.
Address to the Primate(1834), 49–50.
Æstheticism and Worship, 213.
Allegories on the lines of the Revival, 214.
Allies, Rev. T. W., 182.
All Saints', Margaret Street, 201, 205.
Anderdon, J. D., 176, 177.
Anglican Claim, The (Wiseman), 90.
Apostolical Succession, The, 28, 54–6, 60, 85.
"Apostolicals, The", 56.
Appeal in matters of doctrine and ritual, 205.
Appendix to Bp. Jebb's Sermons, 18.
Arians, History of the, Newman's, 45.
Arnold, Dr., of Rugby, 71, 73, 92.
Ashwell, Canon, 162, 172.
Assize Sermon, Keble's, 29–36.
Association of the Friends of the Church, 49–50, 53, 56.

Badeley, E. L., 183.
Bagot, Bp., 85–7, 89, 104, 112–3.
Bailey, Archdeacon, 198.
Bampton Lectures, Hampden's, 71–2, 172.
Bampton Lectures, Miller's, 27.
Baptism, Pusey's three Tracts on, 63.
Baptismal Regeneration, 43, 173–4, 177, 183.
Baptistery, The, J. Williams', 190.
Bennett, Rev. J. W. E., 204, 214, 218.
Bernard, Mountague, 132.
Blomfield, Bp. C. J., 162, 200, 204.
Blunt, Professor J. J., 138.
Bowden, J. W., 86, 92.
Boyce, E. J., 191.
British Critic, The, 90, 111–3, 137, 179, 195–6, 197.
British Magazine, The, 20, 68, 137, 198.
Burgon, Dean J., 19, 30.
Butler, Dean W., 142, 218.

Cambridge Camden Society, 139–142, 191.
Cambridge—Evangelical element in, 135–6.
Cambridge—indirect influence on the Revival, 143–5.
Cambridge—its share in the Revival, 135–145.
Catenæ Patrum, Newman's, 77, 88.
Cathedral, The, J. Williams', 190.
"Catholic Emancipation Act", 9.
Choral services, 192, 201.
Christian Observer, The, 169.
Christian Remembrancer, The, 46, 129–130, 185, 196–7.
Christian Year, Keble's, 24–7, 36, 49, 97, 188, 214.
Church, Dean, 97, 128, 133, 185, 210.
Church Building Society, 10.
Church Congresses, 219.
Church History, revived study of, 212.
Church Missionary Society, 10.
Church Quarterly Review, The, 142.
Church Restoration, effects of, 199–200.
Church Unions, 184–6.

Churton, Archd., 100, 158, 174.
"Clapham Sect, The", 13, 16.
"Clapton Sect, The", 13, 16.
Claughton, Bp., 218.
Coleridge, Sir J. T., 102, 110.
Coleridge, S. T., 17, 221.
Coloured stoles, 200.
Convocation (Oxford), 72, 110.
Convocation (Provincial Synod), 219.
Copeland, Rev. W. J., 58, 95.
Copleston, Bp. (Provost of Oriel), 43, 71.
Corporation Act, 9.
Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 35.
Court of Delegates, 206.
Coventry, Dr. Hook at, 149–150.

"Declaration of the Laity" (1834), 50–1.
Denison, Bp., 162, 218.
Development of Doctrine, Essay on the, Newman's, 118–9, 180.
Diocesan Conferences, 219.
Dodsworth, Rev. W., 181–2.
Donatists, the, 91.
Dublin Review, The, 90.

Ecclesiological Society, The, 191, 192.
Ecclesiologist, The, 142, 191.
Episcopate, Increase of the, 219.
Evangelical Revival, The, 11, 15, 208, 217.
Evangelicals, The, 12, 41–2, 81, 216–7, 220.
Evans, Archd. R. W., 136.

Faber, Rev. F. W., 221.
Fabrics of churches before the Revival, 196–7.
Fasting, Pusey's Tract on, 62, 121.
Fathers, Study of the, 23–4.
Faussett, Prof. (Oxford), 107–8.
Froude, Archd., 47, 50, 56–7.
Froude, R. Hurrell, 21, 32, 44–5, 47, 50, 56, 56, 70–1, 215.
Froude's *Remains*, 81–3, 92.

Garbett, Archd., 106.
German Theology, 38–9, 40–1.
Gilbert, Bp., 141.
Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., 110, 192, 202.
Golightly, Rev. C. P., 58, 84, 93, 100.
Gorham, Rev. G. C., 173–4.
Gorham Judgment, The, 173–4, 180–4.
Griffiths, Rev. J., 100.
Guardian, The, 130–3.
Guilds, 219.

Haddan, Rev. A. W., 131–2.
Haddan, T. H., 131.
Hadleigh Rectory, meeting at, 28–9, 31–2.
Hamilton, Bp. W. K., 218.
Hampden, Bp. R. D., 71–4, 106–7, 108, 168–173.
Hampden Controversy, The (1836), 71–4.
Hampden Controversy, The (1847), 168–173.
Hare, Archd. J., 170.
Harrison, Archd. B., 84.
Hawkins, Dr. E., Provost of Oriel, 108, 172.
Hebdomadal Board (Oxford), 100–2, 115.
Herbert of Lea, Lord, 205.
Hills, Bp. G., 218.
Holy Eucharist as a Comfort to the Penitent, Pusey's Sermon on the, 107.
Hook, Dean W. F., 84, 85, 101, 147–161.
Hope, Rt. Hon. A. J. Beresford, 142, 193–5, 201.
Hope-Scott, J. R., 182–3, 193–4.
Host, Prof. F. J. A., 143–4.
Howley, Abp., 169, 179.
Hursley, 188.

Ideal of a Christian Church, The (Ward), 113–5.
Indian Episcopate, The, 10.
Irish Temporalities Act (1833), 28.

Jebb, Bp. J., 18, 149.
Jelf, Dr. R. W., 100, 108, 158.

Jenkyns, Dr. R., Master of Balliol, 108.
Jerusalem Bishopric, The, 91–2.
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 206–7.

Kaye, Bp. J., 23–4, 138, 162.
Keble, Rev. J., 15, 17, 21, 24–7, 29–31, 33–5, 45, 47–9, 64, 81–3, 84, 86, 94, 96–8, 102, 122, 175, 184–5, 188, 215, 221.
Keble, Rev. T., 58, 94, 215.
King, Rev. Bryan, 201.
Knox, Alexander, 18.

Law, Rev. W., 98.
Le Bas, Rev. C. W., 137.
Leeds, Dr. Hook at, 150 *et seq.*, 218.
"Letter of the 4 tutors" (on Tract 90), 100–1.
"Letter to the Bishop of Oxford", Pusey's, 89.
Liberalism at Oxford, 43, 44, 117.
Library of the Fathers, 68–9, 88.
Liddledale, Dr. R., 140, 141 *n.*
Liddon, Canon H. P., 206.
Lightfoot, Bp. J. B., 143.
Littlemore, 105, 116, 189–190.
Lloyd, Bp. C., 21–2, 38, 39.
Longley, Abp., 152, 153, 169.
Lonsdale, Bp. J., 162.
Lowder, Rev. C. F., 201, 211.
Lowe, Rt. Hon. R., 103.
Lyra Innocentium, 188, 214.

Mackonochie, Rev. A. H., 201, 211.
Macmullen, Rev. R. G., 106–7, 153–5, 156.
Maltby, Bp. E., 187.
Manning, Card. H. E., 175–181, 184.
Margaret Chapel, services at, 201–3.
Marriott, Rev. C., 68, 74 *n.*, 126–8, 215.
Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford, 83–5.
Maskell, Rev. W., 181.
Mill, Dr. W. H., 137.
Miller, Rev. J., 27.
Milnes, Rt. Hon. Monckton, 102.
Moberly, Bp. G., 218, 228.
Monk, Dr. W. H., 192.
Monophysites, The, 90.
Monro, Rev. E., 214.
Motett Society, The, 192.
Mozley, Prof. J. B., 47, 69, 78, 102–3, 109, 116, 128–130.
Mozley, Rev. T., 19, 48, 59, 123.
Mozley, Mrs. T., 47.
Mysticism, Tract 89 on, 96–8.

Narrative of Events, &c., Palmer's, 112–3.
National Society, The, 10.
Neale, Dr. J. M., 140–1, 143, 191, 214, 221.
Newman, Card. J. H., 21, 41–7, 51–3, 65–7, 70, 72, 76–8, 81–3, 85–7, 89–92, 93–5, 111–2, 116–9, 215, 221.
Noetics, Oriel, 43, 71.
Nonjurors, The, 34, 175.
"No. 89" (Tract), 96–7.
"No. 90" (Tract), 91, 97–104, 115–6, 180.
Norris, Rev. H. H., 56, 136.

Oakeley, Rev. F., 21, 65, 66, 93, 111, 201–3.
Observations on Religious Dissent, Hampden's, 72, 172.
Odium against the Church (1832), 9, 11.
Ogilvie, Prof. C. A., 108.
Optimism in Church of England, 158.
Oriel College, Oxford, 35, 42, 43, 44, 71, 128.
Origines Liturgicæ, Palmer's, 22–3.
"Orthodox, The", 12, 13.
Ouseley, Sir F. G., 192.
Oxford, collapse of movement at, 120.
Oxford, Diocese of, under Wilberforce, 166, 218.
Oxford, Keble's Assize Sermon at, 29.
Oxford, Newman's sermons at S. Mary's, 61.
Oxford after Newman's secession, 121 *et seq.*

Oxford as a proper centre of movement (Newman), 52–3.
Oxford culture seen in the early movement, 134–5.
Oxford Architectural Society, 191.
Oxford Malignants, The (Arnold), 73–4.
Oxford Movement, The (Church), 133 and *passim*.

Paget, Rev. F. E., 214.
Palmer, Sir W. ("of Worcester"), 19, 22–3, 32–3, 51, 53, 55, 56, 78–9, 84, 87, 102, 111–5, 123–4, 158, 163.
Palmer, W. ("of Magdalen"), 63*n*.
Papal Aggression, The, 186–7.
Parker, J. H., 191.
Parochial Sermons, Newman's, 60–1.
Parry, Gambier, 205.
Pattison, Rev. Mark, 69.
"Peculiars, The", 159.
Peel, Sir R., 40.
Perceval, Rev. Hon. A. P., 28, 32–3, 55, 102.
Pew system, 191–2.
Phillpotts, Bp. H., 172, 173–4, 181.
Pioneers of the Revival, 16–27.
Pius IX., Pope, 186.
Plain Sermons by Writers of the Tracts for the Times, 94.
Poetry Professorship at Oxford, 105–6.
Poetry of religion revived, 220.
Practical work of the Revival, 218–9.
Prophetical Office of the Church, &c., Newman's, 76.
Psalmody before the Revival, 197–9.
Pusey, Dr. E. B., 16, 21–2, 37–41, 44, 62–70, 76, 84, 86, 89, 93, 94, 102, 107–111, 121–5, 147–8, 152–161, 174, 185, 186, 188–9, 215.
"Puseyite", The term, 121.

Rationalism (German), 38–9.
Record, The, 170.
Reform Bill (1832), 9.
Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge, J. Williamson, 79–81, 96.
Retreats and Quiet Days, 219.
Richards, Rev. Upton, 202, 203.
Rogers, F. (Lord Blachford), 83, 95, 132–3, 189, 210.
Roman Controversy, The, 74–8 and *passim*.
Romanizing party in the movement, 111 *et seq*.
Rose, Rev. H. J., 18–21, 28, 31–2, 51, 55, 75, 137.
Routh, Dr. M., President of Magdalen, 64, 103, 212–3.
Royal supremacy, Pusey on the, 185.
Russell, Earl, 168, 187.

S. Alban's, Holborn, 205, 210.
S. Andrew's, Wells Street, 205.
S. Barnabas, Pimlico, 192, 204, 210.
S. George's in the East, 201, 210.
S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, 205.
S. Matthias', Stoke Newington, 192.
S. Paul's Cathedral, 205.
S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, 204.
S. Peter's, London Docks, 211.
S. Saviour's, Leeds, 152–157.
S. Thomas', Oxford, 205.
Sale, Canon, 58.
Sargent, Rev. J., 178.
Scholastic Philosophy, Hampden on, 71.
Scott, Sir Walter, 16, 221.
Scott, Rev. W. (of Hoxton), 129, 130.
Secular Courts, 206–7.
Selborne, Earl of, 124.
Selwyn, Bp. G. A., 218.
Sewell, Miss, 214.
Sharp, Martin, 132.
Sisterhoods, 174, 182, 219.
Society for Propagation of the Gospel, 10.
Stanley, Dean A. P., 74*n*., 92.
State of Religious Parties, Newman's Art. on, 90.
Suffragan Bishops, 219.
Sumner, Abp. J. B., 162.
Sumner, Bp. C., 141, 162, 165.

Sumner's *Treatise on Apostolical Preaching*, 43.
Surplice Riots, 200.
Symons, Dr. B. P., Warden of Wadham, 108.

Tait, Abp. A. C., 100.
Tales for the young on the lines of the Revival, 214.
Test Act, 9.
Theological Society founded by Pusey, 67–8.
Theophilus Anglicanus (Wordsworth), 138–9.
Thirty-nine Articles, Newman on the, 98–101.
Thirty-nine Articles, Ward on the, 114–5.
Tracts for the Times, 51–60, 62, 68, 71, 74–5, 97, 104, 107, and *passim*.
Treatise on the Church of Christ (Palmer), 78–9.
Trinity College, Cambridge, 136–7.
Trinity College, Oxford, 42, 105.
Tulloch, Principal, 216.

Utilitarianism, The Revival a protest against, 220, 222.

Via Media, Newman's, 77–8, 89, 90–1.
"Wagner Churches" at Brighton, 205.
Ward, Rev. W. G., 92–3, 102, 108, 111, 113–6.
Watson, Joshua, 16, 51, 136, 174.
Webb, Rev. B., 142, 191.
Westcott, Bp., 143.
Whately, Abp., 43–4, 59, 71.
Wilberforce, Archd. R. J., 44, 166, 180, 184.
Wilberforce, Rev. Henry, 182, 184.
Wilberforce, Bp. S., 74*n*., 84, 85, 161–7, 171–3, 214.
Wilberforce, William, 165.
Williams, Rev. Isaac, 21, 37, 79–81, 90, 94–5, 105–6, 190, 215
Wilson, Rev. H. B., 100.
Wiseman, Card., 75, 186.
Wordsworth, Bp. Charles, 176.
Wordsworth, Bp. Christopher, 130, 137, 138–9, 194–5, 218.
Wordsworth, Dr. Christopher, Master of Trinity, 17, 136, 221.
Wordsworth, William, poet, 17, 136, 221.
Worship in Church of England before the Revival, 192–5, 197–9.
Wynter, Dr., President of St. John's, 108.

Yonge, Miss C. M., 214.

PRINTED BY BLACKIE AND SON LIMITED, GLASGOW.

237.2 Overton, J.H.
AUTHOR
096 The Anglican Revival.
TITLE

237.2
096

Property of
CBF
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library